



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

TransCom model simulations of CH₄ and related species: linking transport, surface flux and chemical loss with CH₄ variability in the troposphere and lower stratosphere

Citation for published version:

Patra, PK, Houweling, S, Krol, M, Bousquet, P, Belikov, D, Bergmann, D, Bian, H, Cameron-Smith, P, Chipperfield, MP, Corbin, K, Fortems-Cheiney, A, Fraser, A, Gloor, E, Hess, P, Ito, A, Kawa, SR, Law, RM, Loh, Z, Maksyutov, S, Meng, L, Palmer, PI, Prinn, RG, Rigby, M, Saito, R & Wilson, C 2011, 'TransCom model simulations of CH₄ and related species: linking transport, surface flux and chemical loss with CH₄ variability in the troposphere and lower stratosphere' Atmospheric chemistry and physics, vol. 11, no. 24, pp. 12813-12837. DOI: 10.5194/acp-11-12813-2011

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.5194/acp-11-12813-2011](https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-11-12813-2011)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Published In:

Atmospheric chemistry and physics

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is an Open-Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are properly cited.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



TransCom model simulations of CH₄ and related species: linking transport, surface flux and chemical loss with CH₄ variability in the troposphere and lower stratosphere

P. K. Patra¹, S. Houweling^{2,3}, M. Krol^{4,3,2}, P. Bousquet⁵, D. Belikov⁶, D. Bergmann⁷, H. Bian⁸, P. Cameron-Smith⁷, M. P. Chipperfield⁹, K. Corbin¹⁰, A. Fortems-Cheiney⁵, A. Fraser¹¹, E. Gloor⁹, P. Hess¹², A. Ito^{6,1}, S. R. Kawa⁸, R. M. Law¹⁰, Z. Loh¹⁰, S. Maksyutov⁶, L. Meng^{12,*}, P. I. Palmer¹¹, R. G. Prinn¹³, M. Rigby¹³, R. Saito¹, and C. Wilson⁹

¹Research Institute for Global Change/JAMSTEC, 3173-25 Show-machi, Yokohama, 2360001, Japan

²SRON Netherlands Institute for Space Research, Sorbonnelaan 2, 3584 CA Utrecht, The Netherlands

³Institute for Marine and Atmospheric Research Utrecht (IMAU), Princetonplein 5, 3584 CC Utrecht, The Netherlands

⁴Wageningen University and Research Centre, Droevendaalsesteeg 4, 6708 PB Wageningen, The Netherlands

⁵Universite de Versailles Saint Quentin en Yvelines (UVSQ), GIF sur Yvette, France

⁶Center for Global Environmental Research, National Institute for Environmental Studies, 16-2 Onogawa, Tsukuba, Ibaraki, 305-8506, Japan

⁷Atmospheric, Earth, and Energy Division, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, 7000 East Avenue, Livermore, CA 94550, USA

⁸Goddard Earth Sciences and Technology Center, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Code 613.3, Greenbelt, MD 20771, USA

⁹Institute for Climate and Atmospheric Science, School of Earth and Environment, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT, UK

¹⁰Centre for Australian Weather and Climate Research, CSIRO Marine and Atmospheric Research, 107–121 Station St., Aspendale, VIC 3195, Australia

¹¹School of Geosciences, University of Edinburgh, King's Buildings, West Mains Road, Edinburgh, EH9 3JN, UK

¹²Cornell University, 2140 Snee Hall, Ithaca, NY 14850, USA

¹³Center for Global Change Science, Building 54, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, 02139, USA

* now at: Department of Geography and Environmental Studies Program, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI 49008, USA

Received: 21 June 2011 – Published in Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.: 1 July 2011

Revised: 1 December 2011 – Accepted: 2 December 2011 – Published: 19 December 2011

Abstract. A chemistry-transport model (CTM) intercomparison experiment (TransCom-CH₄) has been designed to investigate the roles of surface emissions, transport and chemical loss in simulating the global methane distribution. Model simulations were conducted using twelve models and four model variants and results were archived for the period of 1990–2007. All but one model transports were driven by reanalysis products from 3 different meteorological agencies. The transport and removal of CH₄ in six different emission scenarios were simulated, with net global emissions of 513 ± 9 and 514 ± 14 Tg CH₄ yr^{−1} for the 1990s

and 2000s, respectively. Additionally, sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆) was simulated to check the interhemispheric transport, radon (²²²Rn) to check the subgrid scale transport, and methyl chloroform (CH₃CCl₃) to check the chemical removal by the tropospheric hydroxyl radical (OH). The results are compared to monthly or annual mean time series of CH₄, SF₆ and CH₃CCl₃ measurements from 8 selected background sites, and to satellite observations of CH₄ in the upper troposphere and stratosphere. Most models adequately capture the vertical gradients in the stratosphere, the average long-term trends, seasonal cycles, interannual variations (IAVs) and interhemispheric (IH) gradients at the surface sites for SF₆, CH₃CCl₃ and CH₄. The vertical gradients of all tracers between the surface and the upper troposphere



Correspondence to: P. K. Patra
(prabir@jamstec.go.jp)

are consistent within the models, revealing vertical transport differences between models. An average IH exchange time of 1.39 ± 0.18 yr is derived from SF₆ time series. Sensitivity simulations suggest that the estimated trends in exchange time, over the period of 1996–2007, are caused by a change of SF₆ emissions towards the tropics. Using six sets of emission scenarios, we show that the decadal average CH₄ growth rate likely reached equilibrium in the early 2000s due to the flattening of anthropogenic emission growth since the late 1990s. Up to 60 % of the IAVs in the observed CH₄ concentrations can be explained by accounting for the IAVs in emissions, from biomass burning and wetlands, as well as meteorology in the forward models. The modeled CH₄ budget is shown to depend strongly on the troposphere-stratosphere exchange rate and thus on the model's vertical grid structure and circulation in the lower stratosphere. The 15-model median CH₄ and CH₃CCl₃ atmospheric lifetimes are estimated to be 9.99 ± 0.08 and 4.61 ± 0.13 yr, respectively, with little IAV due to transport and temperature.

1 Introduction

The variability of atmospheric CH₄ depends on the spatio-temporal variations of the surface fluxes, atmospheric transport, and destruction due to OH, Cl and O¹D chemistry. In recent years, measurements of CH₄ and related species are being conducted at an increasingly large number of sites at hourly or daily time intervals and with high instrumental precision (Rasmussen and Khalil, 1984; Aoki et al., 1992; Dlugokencky et al., 1998; Cunbold et al., 2002; WDCGG, 2010, for a complete list of observational programs). Satellite CH₄ observations from SCanning Imaging Absorption Spectrometer for Atmospheric Cartography (SCIAMACHY), Atmospheric Infrared Sounder (AIRS), and Greenhouse Gases Observing SATellite (GOSAT) are also becoming available, albeit at a lower precision (Frankenberg et al., 2008; Xiong et al., 2008; Yoshida et al., 2011). Significant developments in understanding the distributions, trends and interannual variations of CH₄ emissions and sinks have been achieved in the past two decades through forward modeling (e.g. Fung et al., 1991; Gupta et al., 1996; Houweling et al., 2000; Dentener et al., 2003; Wang et al., 2004; Patra et al., 2009b). Inverse model results show the ability of the models to reproduce the observed atmospheric CH₄ trends and variabilities within the uncertainty of the processes involved (Hein et al., 1997; Houweling et al., 1999; Mikaloff-Fletcher et al., 2004; Chen and Prinn, 2006; Bousquet et al., 2006; Bergamaschi et al., 2009). However, further improvements (reduction in the posterior emission uncertainty) of inverse modeling results depend on a better quantification of (the errors in) the prior emissions and sinks, and on error reductions in forward model transport. Presently, inverse estimates of global CH₄ emissions range between 500 to 600 Tg yr⁻¹, depending on the transport properties and the chemical loss parameteriza-

tion in the forward models. Bottom-up estimations of Individual flux components vary by even greater percentages (e.g. Matthews and Fung, 1987; Yan et al., 2009).

The performance of atmospheric transport models has been investigated within the TransCom project since the early 1990s for the non-reactive tropospheric species, such as sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆) and carbon dioxide (CO₂) (Law et al., 1996, 2008; Denning et al., 1999). Convective parameterizations in CTMs have been tested through simulation of Radon (²²²Rn), which has a radioactive decay half-life of 3.8 days (e.g. Jacob et al., 1997). The full chemistry model simulations of reactive species with a focus on ozone (O₃) chemistry have also been tested using multiple CTMs, where CH₄ is treated as a tracer with a prescribed concentration evolution (Stevenson et al., 2006, and references therein). Note that most, if not all, full chemistry models do not treat CH₄ in an interactive manner, because of its long lifetime. The CH₄ lifetime ranged from 6.3 to 12.5 yr due to large range of simulated OH concentrations in the participating models (Stevenson et al., 2006). A more conservative estimate of CH₄ lifetime is required for calculating the global warming potential (GWP) for CH₄ and its impact on climate change, or developing effective emission mitigation policies. According to Shindell et al. (2009) the 100-yr integrated GWP of CH₄ is sensitive to changes in oxidant-aerosol precursor emissions and to OH-feedbacks of CH₄ emissions itself. Proper understanding of the CH₄ budget is crucial for these assessments.

The aim of the TransCom-CH₄ experiment is to quantify the role of transport, emission distribution and chemical loss in simulating the interhemispheric (IH) gradient, seasonal cycle, synoptic variation and diurnal cycle of CH₄. Only the first two, IH gradient and seasonal cycles, are discussed in this paper. The dependence of the CH₄ budget on model vertical transport in the stratosphere is also analysed. We setup a long simulation period (1988–2007, including two years of spin-up) for the following reasons: (1) in the 1990s and 2000s methane growth rates have fluctuated between 15 ppb yr⁻¹ to –5 ppb yr⁻¹ (Dlugokencky et al., 1998; Simpson et al., 2006; Rigby et al., 2008), and (2) we would like to obtain a better understanding of the role of emissions (using a set of six CH₄ emissions scenarios), chemical loss, and transport model characteristics, such as the stratosphere-troposphere exchange (STE) and the IH exchange time on CH₄ concentration variations in the troposphere. The proposed 18-yr simulation period allows a proper quantification of the removal fluxes in the troposphere and stratosphere and of the influence of transport processes on these removal rates. Since the previous TransCom intercomparison experiments spanned only a few years, the 18 yr of SF₆ simulation allows us to track the interannual variability (IAV) in the IH exchange time for the first time. We also discuss the dependence of CH₄ and CH₃CCl₃ lifetimes on the model grid structure and transport, as well as the transport and temperature as drivers of IAVs in lifetimes.




Fig. 1. Schematic diagram of TransCom-CH₄ model simulation experiment.

In Sect. 2, we describe the experimental protocol, followed by the key information on the participating models and analysis methodology. We focus this analysis (Sect. 3) on the comparison of model results with atmospheric observations of SF₆, CH₃CCl₃ and CH₄ at 8 surface sites and the salient differences in model properties. An attempt is also made to understand possible implications of (1) inert tracer (SF₆) transport or short-lived radioactive tracer (²²²Rn) transport on the lifetimes and distributions of chemically active species (CH₃CCl₃, CH₄), and (2) the effect of the OH abundance, as constrained by CH₃CCl₃, on CH₄. Simulations of SF₆, ²²²Rn, CH₃CCl₃ and six CH₄ emission scenarios are commonly referred to as model tracers. Scope for further analysis using the TransCom-CH₄ database and conclusions are given in Sects. 4 and 5, respectively.



2 Models, measurements and methods



Previous TransCom experiments focused on chemically non-reactive species (SF₆, CO₂, ²²²Rn). A CH₄ intercomparison requires the introduction of atmospheric chemistry. Additionally, the sources and atmospheric lifetime of CH₄ are distinctly different from CO₂, which may provide a different view on transport model differences. Detailed doc-

umentation of the requested simulation is available in the TransCom-CH₄ protocol (Patra et al., 2010). Chemistry-transport model simulations were requested for the period of 1 January 1990 to 31 December 2007, after a spin-up of 2-yr (1988–1989) using analyzed or atmospheric general circulation model (AGCM) meteorology or a combination of both (referred here as AGCM-nudged). A schematic diagram of TransCom-CH₄ model intercomparison set-up is shown in Fig. 1.

2.1 Photochemical and surface loss processes

The following chemical removal reactions for CH₄ (R1–R3) and CH₃CCl₃ (R4–R6) are prescribed in the forward simulations.





The temperature-dependent reaction rates (k ; units: cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹) are taken from the JPL synthesis of chemical kinetics (Sander et al., 2006). The monthly-mean OH fields are provided here for online calculation in the model by combining the semi-empirically calculated tropospheric (Spivakovsky et al., 2000) and 2-dimensional (2-D) model simulated stratospheric distributions. For CH₄ reactions with Cl and O¹D radicals in the stratosphere, parameterized loss rates [$k_{\text{O}^1\text{D}} \times \text{O}^1\text{D} + k_{\text{Cl}} \times \text{Cl}$] are provided, which are based on the Cambridge 2-D model (Velders, 1995).

The tropospheric OH field is reduced by 8 %, an amount that was required to optimize the agreement between the TM5 simulated and observed CH₃CCl₃ decline since 2000 (Huijnen et al., 2010). The model simulations performed here allow us to verify whether observations of CH₃CCl₃ can also be reproduced for a longer simulation period, i.e. 1990–2007, by TM5 and a variety of other models. The supplied OH field has about equal OH abundance in the Northern Hemisphere (NH) and the Southern Hemisphere (SH) (Spivakovsky et al., 2000). Since the NH/SH OH-ratio in full chemistry model simulations varies between 1.1 and 1.5 (Krol et al., unpublished data, 2008, based on the model intercomparison described in Shindell et al., 2006) we encouraged modelers to submit another set of simulations using their preferred OH field, e.g. obtained by a full chemistry version of their model.

For CH₃CCl₃ (MCF), the photolysis rates J due to solar UV radiation are provided from an Atmospheric general circulation model-based CTM (ACTM; Patra et al., 2009b) and interpolated on each model's grid. Because the resolution in the stratosphere varies widely between models, it is necessary to scale the stratospheric loss of MCF to a common value. This value is calculated by mass-weighted averaging:

$$J_{\text{av,CH}_3\text{CCl}_3} = \frac{\sum_{i,j,k} J_{\text{CH}_3\text{CCl}_3}(i,j,k) \times M(i,j,k)}{\sum_{i,j,k} M(i,j,k)} \quad (1)$$

Here, $M(i,j,k)$ denotes the air mass in gridbox (i,j,k) from ACTM. Modelers were required to scale their interpolated J_{MCF} field to match the $J_{\text{av,MCF}}$ field of the mass-weighted annual and global mean $J_{\text{av,MCF}}$ value of $7.959 \times 10^{-8} \text{ s}^{-1}$. Similarly, the annual and global mean rate constant for CH₄ oxidation due to stratospheric Cl and O¹D combined is rescaled to $2.069 \times 10^{-10} \text{ s}^{-1}$.

The monthly deposition velocities (deposition_{CH₃CCl₃}; units: m s⁻¹) of CH₃CCl₃ to ocean surfaces are provided by Krol et al. (1998; see also Kanakidou et al., 1999). This sink should be applied in the model as:

$$\text{CH}_3\text{CCl}_3 = (\text{CH}_3\text{CCl}_3)_0 \times \exp\left(-\text{deposition}_{\text{CH}_3\text{CCl}_3} \times \frac{1}{dz} \times dt\right) \quad (2)$$

where, dz = atmospheric lowest layer depth (m), dt = timestep (s), and subscript 0 indicates initial concentration.

Radon decays in the atmosphere with a half-life of 3.8 days, and this decay is calculated in the model at each timestep, following

$$^{222}\text{Rn} = \left(^{222}\text{Rn}\right)_0 \times \exp(-dt \times 2.11 \times 10^{-6}) \quad (3)$$

where ^{222}Rn is the radon mixing ratio at all gridpoints. This setup follows the recommendation of World Climate Research Programme (Jacob et al., 1997).

Due to the long timescales of CH₄ and CH₃CCl₃ oxidation and vertical transport in the stratosphere (age-of-air ~5 yr), several years of spin-up are required to establish realistic CH₄ and CH₃CCl₃ vertical profiles throughout the model atmosphere. A set of 3-D initial conditions, prepared following a 10-yr spin-up simulation by ACTM, were made available for 1 January 1988 for CH₄, SF₆ and CH₃CCl₃. CH₄, SF₆ and CH₃CCl₃ concentrations at South Pole (SPO) are 1655 ppb, 1.95 ppt and 130 ppt, respectively, for January 1988. Radon will be spun-up quickly due to its half-life of several days. Hence, its initial concentration is set to zero.

2.2 Fluxes

The typical seasonal variations of the six CH₄ emission scenarios are shown in Fig. 2a. Annual total emissions time series are depicted in Fig. 2b for CH₄, and in Fig. 2c for SF₆ and CH₃CCl₃. The following source and sink components of CH₄ were considered in the six different scenarios listed in Table 1:

1. Interannually varying anthropogenic emissions (IAV ANT), based on annual mean 1° × 1° maps from the Emission Database for Global Atmospheric Research (EDGAR; version 3.2/FT) (Olivier and Berdowski, 2001). The combination of different emission categories and the inter-/extra-polation of EDGAR emission maps for the years 1990, 1995, 2000 are described elsewhere (Patra et al., 2009b).
2. Anthropogenic emissions (IAV ANT E4), based on a more advanced EDGAR database (version 4.0) (<http://edgar.jrc.ec.europa.eu>), where 1° × 1° emission maps are available for each year until 2005. The 2005 emissions were also used for the 2006–2008 period.

Table 1. List of tracers simulated in the TransCom-CH₄ intercomparison project. See Sect. 2.2 for a description of the CH₄ flux components; e.g. cyclostationary natural (CYC NAT), interannually varying anthropogenic (IAV ANT), biomass burning (BB), wetland (WL).

Parameters	Description	Time resolution
CH ₄ tracers using different emission scenarios		
1. CH ₄ -CTL	CYC NAT (CYC BB & CYC WL) + IAV ANT EDGAR 3.2	Monthly; Partial IAV
2. CH ₄ -CTL.E4	CYC NAT + IAV ANT EDGAR4.0	Monthly; Partial IAV
3. CH ₄ -BB	CYC NAT – 0.35 CYC BB + IAV BB + IAV ANT EDGAR 3.2	Monthly; Partial IAV
4. CH ₄ -WL-BB	CYC NAT – 0.35 CYC BB + IAV BB – CYC WL + 0.76 IAV WL + IAV ANT EDGAR 3.2	Monthly; Full IAV
5. CH ₄ -INV	IPSL/LSCE inversion	Monthly; Full IAV
6. CH ₄ -EXTRA*	CYC NAT – 0.35 CYC BB + IAV BB – CYC WL – Rice + IAV WLe (0.69 Wetland + 0.895 Rice) + IAV ANT EDGAR 3.2	Monthly; Full IAV
Other species/tracers		
7. SF ₆	EDGAR4.0; Global totals modified	Annual; Full IAV
8. Radon-222 (²²² Rn)	1.0 and 0.1 atom m ^{−2} s ^{−1} over land and ocean, respectively	Annual; No IAV
9. CH ₃ CCl ₃ (MCF)	EDGAR3.2 with trends and distributions modified	Annual; Full IAV

* this scenario is called EXTRA because the VISIT terrestrial ecosystem model (Ito and Inatomi, 2011) fluxes are still under evaluation, but included here since no other bottom-up wetland emission scenario was available with IAV for the full simulation period at the time the intercomparison protocol was released. VISIT is driven by climate variables from the Climate Research Unit time series version 3.0 (CRU TS3.0) dataset (Mitchell and Jones, 2005; updated values) and NCEP/NCAR reanalysis (Kalnay et al., 1996) for the periods of 1988–2005 and 2006–2007, respectively, and CH₄ cycling in the inundated areas is modeled using the scheme of Cao et al. (1998, and references therein).

3. Cyclostationary natural emissions (CYC NAT), such as those from all types of natural wetlands, domestic and large-scale biomass burning, and termites, based on the GISS inventory (Matthews and Fung, 1987; Fung et al., 1991), and emissions due to rice paddies taken from Yan et al. (2009). All these emissions are scaled as in Patra et al. (2009b). Though predominantly anthropogenic, emissions from rice cultivation are included in this category because its seasonal cycle is controlled by seasonal rainfall and temperature. The emissions due to oceanic exchange (~ 10 Tg CH₄ yr^{−1}) are distributed over the coastal region (Lambert and Schmidt, 1993; Houweling et al., 1999) and mud volcano emissions are based upon Etiope and Milkov (2004).

4. Wetland emissions with interannual variation (IAV WL) have been derived from the wetland emission module of the ORganizing Carbon and Hydrology in Dynamic Ecosystems (ORCHIDEE) terrestrial ecosystem model (Ringeval et al., 2010). This model uses satellite-derived area of inundation for the period of 1994–2000 (Prigent et al., 2007). The emission is scaled by a multiplication factor of 0.76 to match the wetland emission component in CYC NAT. An average seasonal cycle is

used for the rest of the simulation periods (1988–1993 and 2001–2008).

5. Second set of wetland and rice emissions (IAV WLe) is obtained from the Vegetation Integrative Simulator for Trace gases (VISIT) terrestrial ecosystem model (Ito and Inatomi, 2011), which calculates inundated area based on analyzed rainfall, temperature (Mitchell and Jones, 2005). The rice and wetland emissions are scaled by 0.895 and 0.69, respectively, to match with CYC NAT.

6. Biomass burning emissions (IAV BB) are taken from the Global Fire Emission Database (GFED version 2), representing mainly forest and savannah burning (van der Werf et al., 2006). Since this dataset is available only after 1997, an average seasonal cycle is used for the 1988–1996 period. Unlike the wetland emissions, global total IAV BB emissions are lower than those incorporated in CYC NAT. Thus biomass burning emissions in CYC NAT is only partially replaced by IAV BB (see Table 1). This methodology is likely to double count some of the open burning and to underestimate the emissions from closed burning.




Fig. 2. Examples of CH₄ emission seasonalities corresponding to the years 1997 and 1998 are shown in (a) (the black line is hidden behind the red line), and annual mean CH₄ emissions for the period of 1988–2008 are depicted in (b). The annual mean SF₆ and CH₃CCl₃ fluxes are shown in (c).

7. Inversion-derived emissions (IAV INV) are obtained by optimizing surface fluxes to reproduce the measured CH₄ concentrations using the LMDZ model for the period of 1988–2005 (Bousquet et al., 2006). An average seasonal cycle is repeated for 2006–2008.
8. The soil sink represents a climatological average year, accounting for seasonality, derived from the LMDZ atmospheric CH₄ inversion (Bousquet et al., 2006). The global total removal amounts to 27.21 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹.

The integrated CH₄ emissions for the different combinations of emission fields (scenario 1 to 6 in Table 1) agree within 3 Tg CH₄ over 1990–2005 (8675 Tg CH₄ for CH₄-CTL,

which is 542 Tg yr⁻¹ on average). Only the IAV INV scenario total emissions are slightly lower (8641 Tg CH₄).

Three other species (SF₆, ²²²Rn and CH₃CCl₃) are simulated using the following fluxes:

1. Annual mean SF₆ emission distributions at 1° × 1° are taken from EDGAR 4.0 (2009) for the period 1988–2005, and the global totals are scaled to Levin et al. (2010). The 2005 distribution is used from 2006 onwards. SF₆ emissions increased from 4.77 Tg yr⁻¹ in 1990 to 6.79 Tg yr⁻¹ in 2007.
2. Radon emissions are constructed based on the surface type in each model grid-cell; 0 poleward of 70°, 8.23 × 10⁻²³ mol m⁻² s⁻¹ for 60–70°, and 1.66 × 10⁻²⁰ and 8.30 × 10⁻²³ mol m⁻² s⁻¹ for land and ocean grids, respectively, within 60° S–60° N (Jacob et al., 1997). Radon emission fields were not rescaled to match a global total source, but are expected to produce a global radon source of approximately 2.2 × 10⁻⁶ mol s⁻¹.
3. The annual mean CH₃CCl₃ emission distribution is taken from EDGAR3.2 and linearly corrected for the global totals following McCulloch and Midgley (2001) for the period 1988–1998. Emissions for 1999 to 2002 are taken as 27.5, 26.0, 17.7, and 16.1 Gg yr⁻¹, respectively. After 2002, the regional emission trends follow an exponential decay with a timescale of 5 yr (Krol et al., 2003; updated).

2.3 Participating models and output

Twelve chemistry-transport models and four of their variants (2 at higher horizontal resolution and 2 using different OH, Cl and O(¹D) fields) have submitted simulation results for the period 1990–2007 (Table 2). Half of these models (ACTM, CCAM, IMPACT, LMDZ, PCTM, TM5) also participated in the previous TransCom continuous experiment, where they were tested for interhemispheric transport using SF₆, and synoptic and diurnal scale variability using continuous CO₂ measurements at surface sites (Law et al., 2008; Patra et al., 2008). Six other models (ACCESS, CAM, GEOS-Chem, MOZART, NIES08i, TOMCAT) participated for the first time in a TransCom experiment. The model horizontal resolution varied from 1° × 1° longitude × latitude to 6° × 4°. In the vertical, 19 to 67 levels were employed. Salient features of each model configurations (resolutions, meteorological fields) are given in Table 2 for guidance purpose only, and do not automatically link with model performance as evaluated for various features in this study.

Concerning the wind field and other meteorology, all models, except ACCESS, used meteorological fields from weather forecast models either by interpolation (offline models) or by nudging towards horizontal winds (*U*, *V*) and temperature (online models). Most models generated output as

Table 2. Overview of participating transport models and model variants, and average lifetimes of atmospheric CH₄ and CH₃CCl₃ are given.

Sl. No.	Model name ^a	Institution ^b	Resolution		Meteorology ^e	Avg. lifetime (1992–07) ^f	
			Horizontal ^c	Vertical ^d		CH ₄ -CTL	CH ₃ CCl ₃
1	ACCESS	CSIRO	$3.75 \times 2.5^\circ$	38	AGCM; SST	9.93 ± 0.13	4.55 ± 0.15
2	ACTM	RIGC	$\sim 2.8 \times 2.8^\circ$	67 σ	NCEP2; U, V, T; SST	10.0 ± 0.10	4.60 ± 0.13
2a	<i>ACTM.OH^g</i>	RIGC	$\sim 2.8 \times 2.8^\circ$	67 σ	NCEP2; U, V, T; SST	9.51 ± 0.10	4.84 ± 0.13
3	CAM	CU	$2.5 \times \sim 1.9^\circ$	28 σ	NCEP/NCAR	10.2 ± 0.11	3.77 ± 0.13
4	CCAM	CSIRO	~ 220 km	18 σ	NCEP; U, V; SST	9.94 ± 0.27	4.01 ± 0.15
5	GEOS-Chem	UoE	$2.5 \times 2.0^\circ$	30/47 η	NASA/GSFC/GEOS4/5	9.60 ± 0.11	4.70 ± 0.13
5a	<i>GEOS-Chem.DOH</i>	UoE	$2.5 \times 2.0^\circ$	30/47 η	NASA/GSFC/GEOS4/5	9.95 ± 0.11	4.84 ± 0.13
6	IMPACT	LLNL	$5.0 \times 4.0^\circ$	55 η	NASA/GSFC/GEOS4	10.1 ± 0.05	4.63 ± 0.3
6a	<i>IMPACT_1 \times 1.25</i>	LLNL	$1.25 \times 1.0^\circ$	55 η	NASA/GSFC/GEOS4	9.99 ± 0.07	4.54 ± 0.16
7	LMDZ	LSCE	$3.75 \times 2.5^\circ$	19 η	ECMWF; U, V, T; SST	10.0 ± 0.09	3.90 ± 0.25
8	MOZART	MIT	$\sim 1.8 \times 1.8^\circ$	28 σ	NCEP/NCAR	9.88 ± 0.15	3.90 ± 0.15
9	NIES08i	NIES	$2.5 \times 2.5^\circ$	32 σ - θ	JCDAS, ERA-interim-PBL	10.0 ± 0.06	4.75 ± 0.02
10	PCTM	GSFC	$1.25 \times 1.0^\circ$	58 η	NASA/GSFC/GEOS5	10.1 ± 0.1	4.54 ± 0.21
11	TM5	SRON	$6.0 \times 4.0^\circ$	25 η	ECMWF, ERA-interim	10.1 ± 0.12	4.87 ± 0.03
11a	<i>TM5_1 \times 1</i>	SRON	$1.0 \times 1.0^\circ$	25 η	ECMWF, ERA-interim	10.1 ± 0.11	4.88 ± 0.14
12	TOMCAT	UoL	$\sim 2.8 \times 2.8^\circ$	60 η	ECMWF, ERA-40/interim	9.98 ± 0.12	4.71 ± 0.18

^a CTMs driven by AGCM transport are identified in bold (nudging parameters in right-most column), and model variants are shown in italics. The model variants are indicated by post-fixed parameters, following a “_”.

^b CSIRO: Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Australia; GSFC: NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, USA; RIGC: Research Institute for Global Change, Japan; CU: Cornell University, USA; LLNL: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, USA; LSCE: Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement, France; NIES: National Institute for Environmental Studies, Japan; SRON: Netherlands Institute for Space Research; UoE: University of Edinburgh, UK; UoL: University of Leeds, UK.

^c Longitude \times latitude or distance or spectral resolution indicated by T (triangular) maximum wave number (T42 and T63 for $\sim 2.8 \times 2.8^\circ$ and $\sim 1.8 \times 1.8^\circ$, respectively).

^d Terrain-following (height) coordinate system for ACCESS, σ vertical coordinates are pressure divided by surface pressure, η vertical coordinates are a hybrid sigma-pressure coordinate (GEOS-Chem has 30 or 47 layers for 1990–2006 or 2007, respectively), NIES08i has a hybrid sigma-isentropic.

^e The source of meteorology (NCEP2 (AMIP DOE II): Kanamitsu et al., 2002; NCEP: Kalnay et al., 1996; NASA/GSFC/GEOS4/5: Bloom et al., 2005; ECMWF: Uppala et al., 2005; JCDAS: Onogi et al., 2007) and parameters used in nudged AGCMs are given.

^f The averaging period for IMPACT_1 \times 1.25 (2002–2007) and TM5_1 \times 1 (2003–2007) differ.

^g The tropospheric OH field is taken from CHASER full chemistry model (Sudo et al., 2002) and scaled by $\times 0.88$, and stratospheric OH is taken from AGCM (Takigawa et al., 1999) as discussed in Patra et al. (2009a). SF₆ emissions are used from EDGAR4.0 without scaling the global totals to match with Levin et al. (2010).

1-hourly averages, except LMDZ and MOZART, which provided output as 3-hourly averages.

Details of individual transport models can be found in the following references; ACCESS (Corbin and Law, 2011), ACTM and ACTM.OH (Patra et al., 2009a, b), CAM (Gent et al., 2009), CCAM (Law et al., 2006), GEOS-Chem and GEOS-Chem.DOH (Pickett-Heaps et al., 2011; Fraser et al., 2011), IMPACT and IMPACT_1 \times 1.25 (Rotman et al., 2004), LMDZ (version 4; Hourdin et al., 2006), MOZART (version 4; Emmons et al., 2010), NIES08i (Belikov et al., 2011), PCTM (Kawa et al., 2004), TM5 and TM5_1 \times 1 (Krol et al., 2005), TOMCAT (Chipperfield, 2006).

The TransCom-CH₄ experiment archived model simulations for 18 yrs and 9 tracers. We have sampled model output at 280 surface sites and 115 vertical profile sites (at all model levels within the troposphere) at hourly time intervals. 3-D output at 17 standard pressure levels for monthly-means for 1990–2007, and noon-time daily values for 2001–2007 are also archived.

2.4 Observational data sources and processing

Selected sites from the Advanced Global Atmospheric Gases Experiment (AGAGE; <http://agage.eas.gatech.edu>) and the NOAA Earth System Research Laboratory, Global Monitoring Division (<http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd>) networks are used in this study. These sites all have simultaneous measurements of CH₄, SF₆, and CH₃CCl₃ covering the 1990s and 2000s (Table 4). Unfortunately, radon measurements are not available for most of these sites. Monthly or annual mean observations have been calculated from continuous (hourly averages) or flask sampling (events) measurements data available from the World Data Center for Greenhouse Gases website (WDCGG, 2010). NOAA flasks are usually sampled under clean air (or baseline) conditions; this is usually onshore flow at coastal sites. The AGAGE continuous records have been flagged to remove local and regional pollution events.

The model outputs are extracted for the corresponding sites and sampling time from the hourly surface data files. All the models sampled concentrations for BRW and CGO stations at the nearest full ocean grid, i.e. BRWOCN and CGOOCN, respectively, to better represent baseline

conditions. However, note that some models, e.g. TM5, interpolate model output to the site locations, and submit identical values at the land and ocean grids for the coastal sites. The results of HBA (75.6° S, 26.5° W, 10 m) site are used as a replacement for the SPO site for PCTM. These selections are made as per the modeler's advice.

For CH₄, the NOAA-2004 calibration scale (Dlugokencky et al., 2005) agrees within 5 ppb with the AGAGE/Tohoku University calibration scale (Aoki et al., 1992). The calibration scales for CH₃CCl₃ are as per the Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO) 2005 (Prinn et al., 2005) for AGAGE and NOAA-2003 (http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/cc1/scales/CH3CCl3_scale.html) for NOAA sites. Those for SF₆ are based on SIO 2005 (Rigby et al., 2010) and NOAA-2006 (http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/cc1/sf6_scale.html). The AGAGE and NOAA scales for SF₆ are in excellent agreement (NOAA–AGAGE = 0.02 ± 0.01 ppt, compared to repeatability of the analytical system of 0.04 ppt) (Rigby et al., 2010). The systematic NOAA–AGAGE difference of ~4 ppt in 1992 reduces linearly to around 0 ppt in 2001 for the CH₃CCl₃ concentrations as determined from co-located measurements at CGO, SMO and MHD by both the networks (P. Krummel and T. Arnold, personal communication, 2010).

As a check for the stratospheric CH₄ distribution simulated by the models, a climatology of CH₄ vertical profiles measured by the ACE-FTS (Atmospheric Chemistry Experiment – Fourier Transform Spectrometer) instrument onboard the SCISAT-1 satellite in the upper troposphere and stratosphere altitudes has been used (De Mazière et al., 2008). Please note that the data coverage of the ACE-FTS instrument in the tropical region is sparse. The HALOE/UARS (Halogen Occultation Experiment onboard the Upper Atmosphere Research Satellite) (Park et al., 1996) had a denser coverage and measurements of stratospheric CH₄ from this are also used for validating simulated vertical gradients in the tropical stratosphere (100–10 mb).

For this analysis, the models were sampled within 1 to 3 h of the sampling times of the measurements. Time series were constructed of monthly or annual mean samples for verification of model simulated seasonal cycles and interannual variability, respectively. The Pearson's moment correlation (Press et al., 1986) analysis is performed to evaluate the agreements between the simulated and observed time series for seasonal cycles and interannual variations at the 8 selected sites.

2.5 Calculation of IH gradients, IH exchange time, and atmospheric lifetimes

The IH exchange time (τ_{ex}) is estimated from the SF₆ annual mean concentration time series and the ratio of emission in the NH (E_{n}) and SH (E_{s}) using (Patra et al., 2009a, and references therein):

$$\tau_{\text{ex}} = \left[\Delta c_{\text{n-s}} \left(\frac{E_{\text{n}}}{E_{\text{s}}} + 1 \right) \right] / \left[\frac{E_{\text{n}}}{E_{\text{s}}} \frac{dc_{\text{s}}}{dt} - \frac{dc_{\text{n}}}{dt} \right] \quad (4)$$

c_{s} and c_{n} are the average concentrations of SH and NH sites, and $\Delta c_{\text{n-s}}$ is IH concentration gradient. Derivation of this equation assumes that $\Delta c_{\text{n-s}}$ is in steady state (Jacob et al., 1987). We used two sites in the NH (BRW, MLO) and SH (CGO, SPO) to estimate the hemispheric average concentrations c_{n} and c_{s} , respectively, at yearly time intervals (dt). Because SF₆ measurements at ALT are not available after 2005, BRW is chosen for this analysis. The values $c_{\text{n}} - c_{\text{s}}$ are shown as IH gradients of each species. We have tested that the calculated τ_{ex} does not depend strongly on the $\frac{E_{\text{n}}}{E_{\text{s}}}$ ratio.

We also estimated CH₄ and CH₃CCl₃ lifetimes (τ) using the mass balance equation

$$\frac{dB}{dt} = E - L = E - \frac{B}{\tau} \quad (5)$$

B , E and L are the annual total atmospheric burden, net surface emission and photochemical loss, respectively. As approximate estimates of B , average concentrations of CH₄ and CH₃CCl₃ for 8 sites are multiplied by the concentration-to-mass conversion factors of 2.845 Tg CH₄ ppb⁻¹ and 23.689 Gg CH₃CCl₃ ppt⁻¹, respectively. Ideally, vertical distribution properties of each species should be accounted for with appropriate air mass factors for calculating B . However, we note that the average lifetimes over the period of 2000–2007 calculated using ACTM simulated gridded loss rates agree within 0.01 yr for CH₃CCl₃ with the lifetimes calculated using Eq. (5) suggesting that the simplification is acceptable.

3 Results and discussions

3.1 Zonal mean concentrations

Figure 3 compares the latitude-pressure variations of the zonal mean CH₄-CTL scenario in the troposphere and lower stratosphere to representative ACE-FTS measurements (please refer to Figs. S1–S17 for individual model comparison plots of ²²²Rn, SF₆ and CH₄ along the 70° E and 180° E longitudes, and zonal mean CH₃CCl₃ distributions corresponding to the years 1994 and 2005). Generally, all models exhibit similar large-scale features, equator-pole latitudinal gradients, and vertical gradients in the lower stratosphere. Most significantly different, however, is the transition between the troposphere and stratosphere and the heights at which the vertical gradients maximize in the models (the green-to-blue shaded regions). The ACCESS/GEOS-Chem/NIES-08i and CAM/MOZART/CCAM models show the maximum and minimum decrease rates of CH₄ with increasing height, respectively, in the height range of 100–50 mb. CAM, CCAM and MOZART models have only few vertical layers above 100 mb and use the same reanalysis wind fields from NCEP, and the NIES model employs isentropic coordinate system in the stratosphere. The formulation of models is known to affect the simulation of tracer




Fig. 3. Annual and zonal mean latitude-pressure (in mb) cross-sections of CH₄ for tropospheric and lower stratospheric altitudes as observed by the ACE-FTS instrument (a; climatology) and as simulated by the models in 2000 (b–q). The black line in (a) shows the climatological tropopause height. The contour lines in (c and d) show CH₄ loss rate (units: molecule cm⁻³ s⁻¹) as in the ACTM and ACTM_OH, respectively. An offset is added to the concentrations in each panel (given after the model name in ppb) that adjusts the model fields to a common average value of 1770 ppb between 950 mb and 500 mb. Detailed model-to-model comparisons for ²²²Rn, SF₆, CH₄ and CH₃CCl₃ for two seasons and over two longitudes are available in the Supplement (Figs. S1–S17).

Table 3. Multi-model averages ($\pm 1\sigma$; and between model variability defined by $1\sigma/\text{average}$, within parenthesis in %) of simulated SF₆ (ppt), CH₄-CTL (ppb), CH₃CCl₃ (ppt) and ²²²Rn ($\times 10^{-21}$) gradients in the troposphere and UT/LS region for three broad latitude bands, namely, the SH midlatitude, tropics and NH midlatitude.

Species	SH (60–30° S)	Tropics (15° S–15° N)	NH (30–60° N)
Tropospheric gradients			
Difference between:	850–400 mb	850–200 mb	850–400 mb
SF ₆	-0.026 ± 0.005 (18 %)	0.044 ± 0.017 (39 %)	0.128 ± 0.018 (14 %)
CH ₄	-9.91 ± 2.57 (26 %)	17.18 ± 7.69 (45 %)	44.65 ± 5.91 (13 %)
CH ₃ CCl ₃	0.473 ± 0.145 (31 %)	0.295 ± 0.182 (62 %)	1.01 ± 0.25 (25 %)
²²² Rn	0.984 ± 0.527 (54 %)	8.66 ± 2.73 (32 %)	23.90 ± 6.73 (28 %)
UT/LS gradients			
Difference between:	200–100 mb	100–50 mb	200–100 mb
SF ₆	0.158 ± 0.074 (47 %)	0.264 ± 0.148 (56 %)	0.229 ± 0.140 (61 %)
CH ₄	84.45 ± 35.89 (43 %)	124.04 ± 65.07 (52 %)	128.77 ± 64.96 (50 %)
CH ₃ CCl ₃	7.86 ± 1.37 (17 %)	16.59 ± 4.48 (27 %)	9.79 ± 3.75 (38 %)
²²² Rn	1.084 ± 0.708 (65 %)	0.415 ± 0.203 (49 %)	0.353 ± 0.445 (126 %)

Table 4. Average (across all models) correlation coefficient (r) between model simulated and observed seasonal cycles and interannual variation of CH₄, SF₆ and CH₃CCl₃.

Tracer/Site*	ALT	BRW	MHD	MLO	RPB	SMO	CGO	SPO
For seasonal cycles (2002–2003)								
CH ₄ -CTL	.16 ± .3	-.09 ± .2	.73 ± .1	.63 ± .1	.86 ± .1	.74 ± .2	.98 ± .02	.96 ± .1
CH ₄ -CTL-E4	.21 ± .3	-.10 ± .3	.72 ± .1	.69 ± .1	.88 ± .1	.71 ± .2	.97 ± .02	.96 ± .1
CH ₄ -BB	.10 ± .3	-.11 ± .2	.68 ± .1	.66 ± .1	.86 ± .1	.72 ± .2	.95 ± .1	.96 ± .1
CH ₄ -WL-BB	.38 ± .3	.48 ± .2	.42 ± .2	.70 ± .1	.86 ± .1	.64 ± .3	.94 ± .1	.95 ± .1
CH ₄ -INV	.88 ± .1	.63 ± .2	.92 ± .1	.74 ± .1	.88 ± .1	.61 ± .2	.95 ± .02	.92 ± .1
CH ₄ -EXTRA	.84 ± .1	.37 ± .2	.79 ± .1	.50 ± .2	.80 ± .1	.69 ± .3	.93 ± .1	.95 ± .1
SF ₆	.48 ± .2	.23 ± .2	.68 ± .1	-.06 ± .1	.13 ± .2	.70 ± .4	.43 ± .2	.50 ± .2
CH ₃ CCl ₃	.78 ± .1	.93 ± .02	.87 ± .1	.91 ± .1	.96 ± .02	.89 ± .1	.88 ± .1	.81 ± .1
For interannual variations (CH ₄ , CH ₃ CCl ₃ : 1991–2007; SF ₆ : 1996–2007)								
CH ₄ -CTL	.52 ± .2	.14 ± .2	.66 ± .1	.32 ± .2	.34 ± .2	.38 ± .2	.46 ± .2	.43 ± .2
CH ₄ -CTL-E4	.27 ± .2	.01 ± .2	.46 ± .2	-.02 ± .2	.05 ± .3	.24 ± .2	.03 ± .2	-.06 ± .2
CH ₄ -BB	.69 ± .2	.40 ± .2	.76 ± .1	.47 ± .2	.75 ± .1	.54 ± .2	.60 ± .2	.57 ± .2
CH ₄ -WL-BB	.55 ± .2	.47 ± .2	.51 ± .2	.38 ± .2	.68 ± .2	.53 ± .2	.48 ± .1	.46 ± .2
CH ₄ -INV	.64 ± .1	.32 ± .2	.68 ± .1	.27 ± .2	.42 ± .2	.38 ± .2	.63 ± .2	.56 ± .2
CH ₄ -EXTRA	.61 ± .2	.36 ± .2	.77 ± .1	.51 ± .2	.77 ± .2	.73 ± .1	.68 ± .1	.69 ± .1
SF ₆	.33 ± .2	.67 ± .1	.75 ± .2	.70 ± .2	–	.34 ± .1	.83 ± .1	.81 ± .1
CH ₃ CCl ₃	.97 ± .03	.97 ± .03	.95 ± .04	.96 ± .03	.95 ± .04	.96 ± .04	.95 ± .03	.94 ± .03

* ALT (Alert, Canada; 62° W, 82° N, 210 m), BRW (Point Barrow, Alaska, USA; 157° W, 71° N, 11 m), MLO (Mauna Loa Observatory, Hawaii, USA; 156° W, 20° N, 3397 m) and SPO (South Pole Observatory, Antarctica; 25° W, 90° S, 2810 m) are managed under the NOAA cooperative network by the Global Monitoring Division, Earth System Research Laboratory (GMD/ESRL) (Dlugokencky et al., 1998; Butler et al., 2004), and MHD (Mace Head, Ireland; 10° W, 53° N, 25 m), RPB (Ragged Point, Barbados; 59° W, 13° N, 45 m), SMO (Samoa, USA; 171° W, 14° S, 42 m) and CGO (Cape Grim, Australia; 145° E, 41° S, 94 m) sites are operated under the AGAGE network by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT, USA), Scripps Institutions of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego (SIO/UCSD, USA), Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization (CSIRO, Australia), University of Bristol, UK and Georgia Institute of Technology, USA (Cunnold et al., 2002; Prinn et al., 2000)

gradients in the upper troposphere/lower stratosphere region. A version of the TOMCAT/SIMCAT model, which uses isentropic coordinates in the stratosphere, produces stronger tracer gradients and a more realistic Brewer Dobson circu-

lation than the p-coordinate version used here (e.g. Hos-saini et al., 2010, and references therein). The “tropical pipe” (Plumb, 1996) along the upward transport branch of the Brewer-Dobson circulation appears more “leaky” in the




Fig. 4. Time series of differences between observed and simulated annual mean CH₄ in CH₄-CTL scenario (top row), SF₆ (middle row) and CH₃CCl₃ (bottom row) at two selected sites: MLO (left column) and CGO (right column). Time series of annual mean values and tropospheric model values, averaged over 1000–200 mb and all latitudes/longitudes, are shown in Figs. S18 and S19, respectively.

models than in the limb-viewing remote sensing observations by HALOE and ACE-FTS. As a result, the simulated concentration isopleths appear flatter compared to the observations with increasing latitudes in both hemispheres. The CH₄ meridional gradients between tropics (Eq–10° N) and northern extratropics (20° N–30° N) are calculated to be 140 ± 72 ppb for the models and 225 ppb for HALOE in the height range of 70–30 mb.

In the troposphere, vertical transport of the NH emission varies between the models, most prominently in the tropical region, where deep cumulus convection is prevalent. Table 3 shows mean vertical gradients and between model variabilities in three broad latitude ranges. Model to model differ-

ences are much less distinct at the mid and high latitudes than in the tropics for SF₆, CH₄ and CH₃CCl₃. However, two main categories of models can be identified based on the density of CH₄ isopleths in the height range between 350 and 200 mb. The position and concentration gradient across the tropopause differs considerably among models. These model features are also present in the SF₆ simulations suggesting the predominant role of transport in the simulation of the CH₄ vertical distributions. The penetrative mass flux due to deep cumulus convection in tropical latitudes is strongest in ACTM and GEOS-Chem (low ²²²Rn concentration difference of $\sim 5.63 \times 10^{-21}$ between 850 and 200 mb), and relatively weaker in NIES08i, PCTM and TOMCAT (high ²²²Rn

concentration difference $> 12 \times 10^{-21}$). This is clearer from the simulated ²²²Rn distributions over the South Asian monsoon region at 70° E during boreal summer (Figs. S2 and S4). It has been shown in Patra et al. (2009a), based on ACTM simulations with and without cumulus parameterization, that deep cumulus convective transport is the main cause for rapid vertical transport of tracers to the upper troposphere (seen as higher ²²²Rn concentrations compared to the lower troposphere). Feng et al. (2011) showed that the online convection scheme used in the TOMCAT runs for this study underestimated the ECMWF archived convective mass fluxes especially in terms of the altitude extent of deep convection in the tropics. The higher horizontal resolution versions of both IMPACT and TM5 resulted in higher ²²²Rn concentrations in the middle-upper troposphere (i.e. smaller difference between 850 mb and 400/200 mb) compared to their respective lower resolution simulations. This is suggesting that some convective processes are being resolved in higher resolution models that are not present in the lower resolution models.

3.2 Model-observation comparison of CH₄, SF₆ and CH₃CCl₃ annual means: 1990–2007

Figure 4 shows the time series of annual mean concentration differences between simulated and observed CH₄, SF₆ and CH₃CCl₃ at two selected sites (MLO and CGO). First SF₆ is considered, which has no chemical loss (middle row). Typical model behaviour is similar at all 8 sites (not shown). For most models, the simulated concentrations divert from the measurements by 0.2 ppt in 1995, after which differences remain at that level. The offsets between models can be explained by initial values assumed by each models. Only ACCCESS shows increasing differences in time until 2006. The ACTM.OH case, which uses EDGAR4.0 emissions without scaling between 1988–2005, and 2005 emission for 2006 and 2007 and produces a slower increase in the model concentration compared to observations after 2000. This suggests that the global total emissions estimated by Levin et al. (2010) and later confirmed by Rigby et al. (2010) are adequate also for independent state-of-the-art transport models.

The CH₃CCl₃ simulations are of an intermediate level of uncertainty, as this species is emitted to the atmosphere by a relatively well quantified industrial use as a solvent. However, uncertainties remain for its loss by reaction with OH in the troposphere, photolysis in the stratosphere and the rate of STE. Until 1990, CH₃CCl₃ emissions were increasing, followed by near-exponential decrease due to stringent restriction of its production/use by the Montreal Protocol (WMO/SAOD, 2003). The lifetimes of CH₃CCl₃ due to photochemical removal is much longer in the stratosphere (~ 28.6 yr) than in the troposphere (~ 5.8 yr) (estimates from ACTM simulated loss rates at model grids; similar estimates of lifetimes using TM5_1 \times 1 are 37.6 and 5.8 yr, respectively). Thus the troposphere to stratosphere transport plays a minor role in the global total budget of CH₃CCl₃

after the late 1990s, because the concentration gradients across the tropopause reduced to less than 10 ppt (ref. Table 3). Although these lifetimes in the stratosphere and troposphere are within the range of independent estimates, 38^{+15}_{-11} and $6^{+0.5}_{-0.4}$ yr, respectively (Prinn et al., 2005), both the mean values are lower for ACTM. Despite the fact that the models were initialized using the same concentration at 1 January 1988, significant differences in the simulated concentrations are found already for 1990, after two years of simulation. The established model-measurement differences in 1990 persist until the end of the simulations (LMDZ CH₃CCl₃ being the only outlier) even though the CH₃CCl₃ concentrations become very small towards 2007. Given the CH₃CCl₃ lifetime of less than 5 yr, these differences are caused by differences in transport and removal rather than the initialization.

CH₄ is the most complicated species considered in the TransCom-CH₄ experiment, because the CH₄ surface emissions and effect of STE are less certain than for CH₃CCl₃. Generally, the models that simulate lower CH₃CCl₃ concentrations compared to the multi-model mean, also yield lower CH₄ concentrations (such as MOZART, CCAM). For example, the high and low-resolution TM5 simulations show the highest concentrations of both CH₄ and CH₃CCl₃ at MLO. However, it is interesting to note that GEOS-Chem (with TransCom OH) calculates the lowest CH₄ concentrations among all models, while the simulated CH₃CCl₃ levels are not distinctly different. LMDZ is among the models that most strongly underestimate the observed level of CH₃CCl₃, whereas the opposite is true for CH₄ (Fig. 4). These contrasting behaviors among models for various CH₄ and CH₃CCl₃ simulations clearly suggest that CH₄ loss due to the reaction with OH in the troposphere is not the only control on the CH₄ budget differences between models and that other factors such as transport differences also play a role (details in Sects. 3.3 and 3.4).

3.2.1 Seasonal cycles

Figure 5 shows model to measurement comparisons of the seasonal cycles of CH₄, SF₆ and CH₃CCl₃ at three selected sites (MLO, SMO and CGO) for the period 2002–2003. These sites have been selected because they are at large distances from the continental emissions for each of these species. To highlight differences in seasonality, approximate linear trends and offsets corresponding to the period 2002–2003 have been subtracted from the monthly-mean values. All models capture the salient features in the seasonal cycles at very high statistical significance (ref. Table 4 for correlation coefficients at 8 sites), except for SF₆ at MLO, where the measurements show unusual fluctuations and a large data gap during 2002. Even for the years with dense data coverage (2005–2006), low average correlation coefficients (r) of 0.3 for the SF₆ seasonal cycles at MLO are obtained due to a very small seasonal cycle of less than 0.04 ppt. In contrast,




Fig. 5. Comparisons of observed and simulated seasonal cycles of CH₄ in CH₄-CTL scenario (top row), SF₆ (middle row) and CH₃CCl₃ (bottom row) at 3 selected sites, MLO (left panel), SMO (middle panel) and CGO (right panel).

the clear seasonalities (amplitude >0.04 ppt) at ALT, MHD, SMO, CGO and SPO are well reproduced by the models ($r > 0.4$; significant at $P = 0.05$ in two tailed Student's t -test for 24 data points). The fact that the models are able to reproduce the observed seasonal cycles indicates that even though the signals are weak, they nevertheless provide useful information for model validation. All models reproduce the CH₃CCl₃ seasonal cycle fairly well at all 8 sites, both in phase and amplitude ($r > 0.8$).

For CH₄, the influence of the surface flux on the simulated seasonal cycles can be studied using the 6 different CH₄ scenarios. The corresponding correlation coefficients, listed in Table 4, suggest that the CH₄ seasonal cycle depends strongly on the implemented wetland and biomass burning fluxes. The CH₄-INV simulations consistently pro-

duce higher correlation coefficients at all the NH sites (ALT, BRW, MHD, MLO and RPB), which was expected because the atmospheric-CH₄ inversion used data from these sites for flux optimization. CH₄-EXTRA results are next best in comparison with measured seasonal cycles for the NH high latitude sites. For any given tracer, the correlation coefficients are highest at remote SH sites, CGO and SPO, compared to all other sites. The use of ACTM.OH and GEOS-Chem.DOH or the higher horizontal resolution versions of IMPACT.1 × 1.25 and TM5.1 × 1 do not always improve the agreement between model and observations compared to the default implementation. These results suggest a need for improving our understanding of the CH₄ flux seasonality in the Northern Hemisphere land regions, noting that the OH loss is realistically represented as seen in the simulated




Fig. 6. Comparisons of observed and simulated annual mean growth rates of CH₄ in NH (top row; ALT, BRW and MHD average), tropics (middle row; MLO RPB and SMO average) and SH (bottom row; CGO and SPO average) for two selected fluxes, CTL (left column) and EXTRA (right column). Growth rate variabilities corresponding 4 other CH₄ scenarios are given in Figs. S20 and S21.

CH₃CCl₃ seasonal cycles. Because ACCESS (blue line) was not run with analyzed winds and temperature, the simulated seasonal cycles are not as good as other models for CH₄ and SF₆ highlighting the role of meteorology in simulating tracer concentrations. The role of meteorology is less pronounced for CH₃CCl₃ because the emissions are weak in the 2000s. A more detailed analysis of seasonality at a larger number of sites will be conducted in a future study.

3.2.2 Interannual variability (IAV)

We calculated growth rates for all tracers as the difference between annual mean concentrations for two adjacent years. The growth rate at January 2000 is shown as the difference between 1999 and 2000 mean concentrations. The simulated and observed SF₆ growth rates (not shown) decreased from ~ 0.25 ppt yr⁻¹ in 1997 to ~ 0.2 ppt yr⁻¹ in 2000. Afterwards, the growth rate steadily increased to ~ 0.25 ppt yr⁻¹ in 2006 (please refer to Table 4 for correlation coefficients; $r \sim 0.7$ for 5 sites). The length of time series considered for the correlation calculation of the IAVs is 1990–2007 for CH₄

(except for CH₄_WL_BB, which has 7 yr of IAV, 1994–2000) and CH₃CCl₃, and 1996–2007 for SF₆ (the period when observations are available). The correlation coefficients greater than 0.44 and 0.53 are statistically significant at $P = 0.05$ for 18 and 12 data points, respectively. Average CH₃CCl₃ growth rates (not shown) hovered around 0 to 5, –12 to –17 and ~ -2.5 ppt yr^{–1} during 1991, 1997 and 2007, respectively, with gradual changes in between. These temporal variations are well simulated by all models ($r > 0.9$). Because both SF₆ and CH₃CCl₃ emissions are of purely anthropogenic origin, their production, consumption and release to the atmosphere vary relatively smoothly in comparison to the natural components of CH₄ emissions.

Figure 6 shows the model-observation comparison of the IAV in CH₄ growth rates for three broad latitude regions: the NH, tropics and SH corresponding to the CTL and EXTRA emissions (refer to Figs. S20 and S21 for others). Averaged observed CH₄ growth rates for the 1990s are 5.25, 5.06 and 7.01 ppb yr^{–1} in the NH, tropics and SH, respectively. Almost no increase in concentration is observed for the 2000s (except for 2007). Additionally, it can be seen that the IAVs in the growth rate are higher at the NH sites compared to the tropical and SH sites. Figure 6 shows that although the CH₄_CTL simulations capture the observed reduction in the decadal average growth rates, the IAV is not well reproduced. Most prominent is the 1997/1998 El Niño event (Langenfelds et al., 2002). During this event the observations show an increase, while the simulations show a decrease in the growth rate. Interestingly, the CH₄_CTL emission and OH concentration (both without IAV) cannot explain this model behavior, which is therefore attributed to the increased CH₄ + OH reaction rate as modified by CH₄ transport and temperature in the model. This, in turn, is caused by the El Niño induced higher air temperatures (Reaction R1), resulting in faster removal of CH₄ from the troposphere and thus a decrease in the growth rate. Indeed, the 1998 CH₄_CTL lifetime (9.82 yr) is estimated to be the shortest among all simulation years.

As seen from Table 4, inclusion of biomass burning emission IAV (CH₄_BB) improves the IAV model-observation agreement at all sites compared to CH₄_CTL. However, when wetland emissions are included (CH₄_WL_BB), the correlations tend to deteriorate. Compared to CH₄_BB, only CH₄_EXTRA produces better model-observation agreement for growth rates (Fig. 6, right panels). The wetland CH₄ emission simulated by the VISIT ecosystem model included in CH₄_EXTRA displays a large positive anomaly on top of the emissions from biomass burning during 1997/1998. Combined, these emissions compensate for the extra CH₄ loss due to higher air temperatures. As a consequence, these emissions result in an excellent agreement with the growth rates observed at the SH and NH sites (except that the simulated tropical signal is a bit too strong in 1998). The IAV of the multi-model average CH₄ growth rate at BRW did not correlate significantly with the observed IAV because this site is located close to the Alaskan wetland region, and the

site representation error is large for the coastal sites in coarse resolution global models (Patra et al., 2008).

The decreasing growth rate in the 1990s, near zero growth rates in early 2000s and the reappearance of positive CH₄ growth in the late 2000s have drawn considerable interests for developing emission inventories. For example, Lamarque et al. (2010) suggested a decrease of CH₄ emissions by about 40 Tg CH₄ from 1990 to 2000 for simulating the zero CH₄ growth rate in the early 2000s using the CAM-Chem model. Their estimate is largely inconsistent with our results, which is suggesting that a steady state is achieved between CH₄ chemical destruction and emissions during the early 2000s (Dlugokencky et al., 2003). The EDGAR4.0 anthropogenic CH₄ emission increase of ~ 4 Tg CH₄ yr^{–1} during 2001–2007, synchronized with the Chinese economic growth, produces inconsistencies between observed and simulated growth rates during 2003–2007 (thus the lowest correlation coefficients for the growth rate IAVs in Table 4; see also Fig. S20). This indicates that forward simulations using multiple forward transport models are useful for the verification of emission inventories.

3.3 Interhemispheric gradients and exchange times

Figure 7 shows the concentration gradients between two NH sites and two SH sites obtained using annual mean observed and modeled time series. All models except for the TM5s, simulate the observed SF₆ IH gradient within the measurement accuracy of ± 0.057 ppt ($\sqrt{2} \times$ measurement precision). These gradients translate to an average IH exchange time (τ_{ex}) of 1.39 ± 0.18 yr (for all models and years), which is an indication of close model-model agreement (Fig. 8). This model-model spread is much smaller compared to the model pool of the 1990s (Denning et al., 1999), which gave τ_{ex} range of 0.8–2.0 yr. In this intercomparison, the τ_{ex} range between models is 0.62 ± 0.06 yr compared to 1.2 yr in the TransCom experiment during the 1990s. The average τ_{ex} of 1.39 yr is in excellent agreement with the estimates of 1.3 yr (Geller et al., 1997) and 1.5 yr (Levin and Hesshaimer, 1996), derived using measured SF₆ time series. The underestimation by ACTM.OH version is due to smaller SF₆ emissions (note: this version used EDGAR4.0 without scaling), highlighting the role of the emission strength in the forward model simulations.

A tendency towards faster IH exchange rate as calculated from Eq. (4) is seen for both the observations and the simulations (a decrease in exchange time by about 0.2 and 0.15 yr, respectively) between 1996–1999 and 2004–2007. A decrease in τ_{ex} could have large implications for estimating fluxes of long-lived species by inverse modelling, especially for the trends in hemispheric emissions and sinks ratio. To investigate the influence of possible shifts in the global SF₆ emission distribution (I. Levin, personal communication, October 2011) sensitivity tests were performed in ACTM using three emission scenarios: (1) same as in TransCom-CH₄




Fig. 7. Interhemispheric gradients (IHGs) for CH₄-CTL, SF₆ and CH₃CCl₃ concentrations between the NH (BRW, MLO) and SH (CGO, SPO) sites. The values at CGO (AGAGE) are adjusted to NOAA scales by adding an offset of 0.02 ppt for SF₆, and multiplied by 1.0003 and 1.0333 for CH₄ and MCF, respectively (see text in Sect. 2.4 for further details). Please note that adjustment of the AGAGE data to NOAA scale is made just for convenience. These 4 sites are chosen here because their data coverage is most complete during 1990–2007. Haley Bay (75.58° S, 26.5° W, 10 m) site is chosen for PCTM due to no SPO data in all files. Inset shows expanded y-axis view of MCF for the 2000–2007 period.

protocol (EDGAR4.0/Levin), (2) the EDGAR4.0 emission distribution corresponding to 2000, but global totals scaled to Levin et al. (2010) (EDGAR_Y2000/Levin), and (3) constant emissions from EDGAR4.0 for the year 2000 (EDGAR_Y2000). Figure 9a shows the trends in SF₆ emissions within three broad latitude bands. The emissions in the NH mid-high latitudes (circles) remained fairly constant




Fig. 8. IH exchange time (τ_{ex}) estimated using the measured and simulated time series of average SF₆ in NH (BRW, MLO) and SH (CGO, SPO) by employing Eq. (4).




Fig. 9. SF₆ emissions in three broad latitude bands (a, top panel), and τ_{ex} (b, bottom panel) estimated using ACTM simulated SF₆ time series for three different emission scenarios. An offset is applied to each τ_{ex} time series for a common value of 1.39 yr in 1996.

(within 14 %) in EDGAR4.0/Levin scenario, while the emissions from the NH tropical latitudes (triangles) increased by more than 100 % during 1996 to 2007. The estimated τ_{ex}

using three emission scenarios are shown in Fig. 9b. These results clearly suggest that the decrease in τ_{ex} is caused by the trends in the SF₆ emission distribution rather than inter-hemispheric transport. The decrease in τ_{ex} becomes an order of magnitude smaller as well as statistically insignificant ($r = -0.34$, $N = 12$) when SF₆ emissions were kept constant (EDGAR_Y2000). The decrease in τ_{ex} remained significant for scenario EDGAR_Y2000/Levin (red square/line). This is probably because the SF₆ IH gradients do not reach steady state, since the emissions decreased during 1995–1998 and increase thereafter till 2008 (Fig. 2c), even though the $\frac{E_n}{E_s}$ ratio was fixed at 36.9, corresponding to the year 2000. Our results indicate that the time evolution of the SF₆ emissions should be introduced at a higher spatial resolution (than the presently used 2-box model), when calculating τ_{ex} .

All three long-lived species show a similar relationship for the IH gradient: the model that produces a larger (smaller) SF₆ IH gradient generally also produces a larger (smaller) IH gradients for CH₃CCl₃ and CH₄ in comparison with the observations (Fig. 10). The intriguing exception is MOZART, which exhibits an excellent match for SF₆ IH gradient, but produces one of the largest CH₄ IH gradients (127 ppb compared to an observed value of 101 ppb) and one of the smallest CH₃CCl₃ gradients (0.13 ppt) during 2003–2007. Similar contrasting behaviour is also seen for several other models at lesser distinction, e.g. GEOS-Chem_DOH, NIES-08i lie below the fitted line for CH₄, but lie above the fitted line for CH₃CCl₃. The CH₄ IH gradients are best reproduced using the CH₄_INV emissions: deviations are within 5 ppb for 7 models (Fig. 10). Taking into account the IH gradient of all three species, TM5/CCAM, ACTM/IMPACT_1×1/PCTM and LMDZ/NIES-08 showed systematically higher, similar and lower IH gradients, respectively, compared to the observations.

Two models submitted simulations using different OH, which can be used to further investigate the sensitivity of the simulated CH₄ and CH₃CCl₃ IH gradients to the IH difference in OH. The NH/SH ratio of hemispheric total tropospheric OH are (1) 1.32 for ACTM.OH and (2) 1.11 for GEOS-Chem.DOH, while that (Spivakovsky et al., 2000) used in ACTM is 0.99. The observed CH₄ IH gradient is 100.97 ppb, while the simulated gradients from ACTM and ACTM.OH are 99.99 and 87.45 ppb, respectively. In order to simulate the observed CH₄ IH gradient precisely, the NH/SH OH ratio for ACTM would need to be 0.97 $[= 0.99 + (1.32 - 0.99) \times \frac{(99.99 - 100.97)}{(99.99 - 87.45)}]$. This is close to the NH/SH OH ratio derived by Spivakovsky et al. (2000). Note also that the ACTM simulations of both CH₃CCl₃ and SF₆ agree very well with the observations. Similarly, to simulate the observed CH₄ IH gradient, the NH/SH OH ratio for GEOS-Chem model should be 1.15 $[= 0.99 + (1.11 - 0.99) \times \frac{(107.53 - 100.97)}{(107.53 - 102.65)}]$. Both GEOS-Chem model versions simulate greater IH gradients also for CH₃CCl₃, a species that has been used for benchmarking tropospheric OH concentrations and distributions. However, the GEOS-Chem sim-




Fig. 10. Correlation between IH gradients of SF₆ with that of CH₄ and CH₃CCl₃ are depicted, using average values for the period 2003–2007 and for 4 sites as in Fig. 7. ACTM.OH is excluded from the linear fitting because the SF₆ emissions are not as per the protocol.

ulated SF₆ IH gradient agrees very well with the observed value. Given the small number of alternative OH distributions in models, and the remaining uncertainties in CH₄, SF₆ and CH₃CCl₃ emissions, our best judgement at the moment is that we cannot falsify the NH/SH gradient (0.99) derived by Spivakovsky et al. (2000).

3.4 Photochemical removal of CH₄ and the role of transport

The calculated photochemical loss of CH₄ varies between 490 and 509 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ during the first eight years (1992–1999), and between 497 and 513 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ during the last eight years (2000–2007) of the simulation. Figure 11a




Fig. 11. Relationships of global loss rates for different models (CH₄-EXTRA) with their simulated growth rates at surface sites (a), and the modeled vertical gradients in the lower stratosphere (100–10 mb layer; b) with growth rate. ACTM.OH and GEOS-Chem.DOH are excluded from this analysis as those models used different OH fields.

suggests that the eight-years averaged growth rates at the surface sites for the different models are, as expected, inversely proportional to the calculated photochemical destruction. However, this relationship appears loose, particularly for 2000–2007, when the models approach steady state (correlation coefficient, $r = -0.42$ for all models, but increase to -0.82 and -0.61 for 1990s and 2000s, respectively, by excluding NIES-08i). Possible explanations are investigated in Fig. 11b, using the vertical gradients in the equatorial lower stratosphere (CH₄ at 100 mb – CH₄ at 10 mb; zonal average for 5° S–5° N latitudes). Models showing greater gradients have slower Brewer-Dobson circulation, and thus stronger trapping of CH₄ in the troposphere, resulting in faster CH₄ destruction and smaller growth rate because CH₄ lifetime in




Fig. 12. Time series of median (symbols) and ranges (broken lines) of atmospheric lifetimes of CH₄ (black) and CH₃CCl₃ (red). Note that the mean CH₄ lifetimes for EXTRA (9.96 ± 0.08 yr) and CTL (9.99 ± 0.08 yr) fluxes agree within their interannual variability. A comparison of CH₃CCl₃ lifetimes calculated using Eq. (5) and gridded photochemical destruction rates is shown in Fig. S22 (ACTM only).

the troposphere is an order of magnitude shorter than that in the stratosphere. Although these relationships are again quite loose during the 1990s, as the models attain their steady state, statistically significant correlations ($r = -0.69$) are found for the period of 2000–2007 between the CH₄ growth rates and vertical gradients in the lower stratosphere. While the growth rates decrease from the 1992–1999 period to the 2000–2007 period in all models, the modeled gradients remain remarkably constant. Based on this analysis we suggest that the simulated concentration growth rates at the surface sites are linked to the troposphere to stratosphere transport rate of CH₄.

Figure 12 shows the temporal variability in the estimated lifetimes (Eq. 5) for CH₄-CTL and CH₃CCl₃ (ref. Table 2 for time-averaged model specific lifetimes). The median CH₄ lifetime due to atmospheric loss processes (Reactions R1–R3) is 9.99 ± 0.08 (1σ for interannual variability) years and ranges from 9.50 ± 0.10 to 10.27 ± 0.14 yr for the different models. Here it should be remembered that all, but ACTM.OH and GEOS-Chem.DOH, models used the same OH distribution. The median CH₄ lifetime for 16 models or model variants agrees well with the lifetime (10.0 ± 0.17) estimated from the measured mean concentrations at 8-sites (Eq. 5). This is because a close balance is achieved between the modeled atmospheric loss and net surface emissions (513 ± 9 and 514 ± 14 Tg CH₄ yr^{−1} for the 1990s and 2000s, respectively). The median CH₃CCl₃ lifetime due to all loss processes (Reactions R4–R6) is estimated to be 4.61 ± 0.13 , 4.59 ± 0.18 and 4.62 ± 0.02 yr during the 1992–2007, 1992–1999 and 2000–2007, respectively. TM5

simulates a lifetime of 4.87 ± 0.03 yr, which is close to the estimates using the measured CH₃CCl₃ concentrations of 4.9 ± 0.3 yr (Prinn et al., 2005), 5.0 yr (WMO/SAOD, 2003) or 4.94 ± 0.15 yr (this study based on 8 sites). All other models calculated a shorter lifetime, by an average value of 0.3 yr. CAM, CCAM, LMDZ and MOZART calculate lifetimes of 4 yr or shorter. The interannual variation in the estimated CH₃CCl₃ lifetimes during the 1990s is an order of magnitude higher than that in the 2000s. We find up to 5 % variability in the modeled CH₃CCl₃ lifetimes during 1992–1999, a period with substantial emissions. During 2000–2007, when the emissions of CH₃CCl₃ dropped significantly, less than 0.4 % variability is simulated. This implies that inversions to estimate OH from CH₃CCl₃ observations are less uncertain since 2000, a finding in good agreement with Montzka et al. (2011).

4 Further work and data accessibility

For this analysis we used results of chemical tracer simulations at only 8 selected sites with measurements of atmospheric CH₄, SF₆ and CH₃CCl₃, which is a very small subset of the 280 surface sites for which output is available. In addition, vertical profiles of chemical tracers and several meteorological parameters have been archived at 115 sites. More analyses on the basis of the TransCom-CH₄ simulations are planned focusing on (1) CH₄ vertical profiles measured using aircraft, (2) analysis of vertical column averaged CH₄ concentrations using TCCON observations, (3) using increase, decrease and exponential decay of CH₃CCl₃ for optimizing tropospheric OH abundance. We also welcome use of this data set by the measurement community. In an effort towards ease of access, time series at a subset of surface sites are archived at JAMSTEC (<http://ebcrpa.jamstec.go.jp/dav/prabir/transcom-ch4/sites.data/>). Information on how to access the full dataset is available in the experimental protocol, archived on this website (http://transcom.project.asu.edu/T4_methane.php).

In addition to the site-specific data, gridded output at monthly intervals at the model horizontal resolution at standard pressure levels are archived for the period 1990–2007. Afternoon averages (12:00–15:00 LT – Local Time) at daily intervals are also archived for the period 2001–2007. We believe these sets of model output, their extension to recent years, will be useful for comparing the model simulations with satellite observations (SCIAMACHY, AIRS, GOSAT) and aircraft observations (e.g. HIPPO – HIAPER Pole-to-Pole Observations of carbon cycle and greenhouse gases study, Wofsy et al., 2011).

5 Summary and conclusions

We analyzed concentration time series of CH₄, CH₃CCl₃, SF₆ and ²²²Rn simulated by 16 chemistry-transport models

as part of the TransCom-CH₄ intercomparison experiment. We focused the analysis on the model-to-model differences in:

1. The vertical redistribution of tracers, based on ²²²Rn simulations and comparisons to CH₄ satellite observations in the upper troposphere and lower stratosphere.
2. Large-scale interhemispheric (IH) transport, by comparing modeled and observed IH gradients of SF₆, CH₄ and CH₃CCl₃.
3. Simulated seasonal cycles, by comparing to observed seasonal cycles at remote background stations.
4. Inter-annual variations in the simulated CH₄ growth rate, by focusing on the results of six different CH₄ emission time-lines.
5. The role of removal by OH on the simulated CH₄ and CH₃CCl₃ concentrations.

The main conclusions can be summarized as follows:

- i. Although the simulated zonal mean ²²²Rn concentrations agree between models, significant differences are observed in regions of deep cumulus convection, e.g. the south Asian summer monsoon domain. Unfortunately, observational evidence to check the model behavior is lacking. Models also differ in the simulated height of large troposphere-stratosphere concentration gradients of CH₄. Compared to CH₄ satellite observations in the upper troposphere, most models appear to be too diffusive around the tropical tropopause.
- ii. The IH exchange time, calculated from the simulated SF₆ distributions, ranges from 1.79 to 1.17 yr (average over 1996–2007) for the different models. The model-average value of 1.39 yr is in close agreement with earlier studies and observational evidence. Models that show faster IH exchange for SF₆, also exhibit faster exchange (smaller IH gradients) for CH₄ and CH₃CCl₃. This multi-tracer evidence provides clear directions for the improvement of specific models. The IH exchange time calculated from the simulated and observed SF₆ time series suggest an acceleration of the IH exchange in the 2000s compared to the 1990s. However, a sensitivity study using 3 different SF₆ emission scenarios show that the acceleration is caused by an increased share of SF₆ emissions in the tropical land regions, compared to the midlatitudes, of the NH as well as non-steady state IH gradients in SF₆ concentrations. The estimated IH exchange time remained constant over the period of our analysis (1996–2007) for a time invariant SF₆ emission scenario.
- iii. All models reproduce the observed seasonal cycles of CH₄ and CH₃CCl₃ at background sites very well. The

simulated CH₄ seasonal cycles depend on the destruction by reaction with OH, concealing the seasonality of the underlying emissions. The simulated seasonal cycles of CH₄ are influenced by the photochemical destruction by OH: without destruction, the simulated seasonal cycles would more strongly reflect the seasonal cycles present in the emission scenarios. Two of the six simulated CH₄ scenarios (CH₄_INV and CH₄_EXTRA) show a higher correlation with the observed seasonal cycle.

- iv. A set of six CH₄ flux representations was used to investigate the role of specific processes in reproducing the observed interannual variations in the CH₄ growth rate. The control emission case (CH₄_CTL) without a significant increase in anthropogenic emissions and no interannual variability in natural emissions for the period 1990–2007 reproduces the declining growth rate in the 1990s, followed by the stabilization in the 2000s. Inclusion of interannual variation in emissions from the wetland and forest fires (CH₄_EXTRA) most successfully simulates the observed interannual variations in CH₄. It was also suggested that the higher tropospheric temperatures during the 1997/1998 El Niño resulted in larger CH₄ destruction, whereas the observations clearly show a rise in CH₄ concentration. To match the observations, either enhanced emissions are required (as in CH₄_EXTRA), or less than average OH should have been present in this period.
- v. The simulation of CH₃CCl₃ is used to check the consistency of the employed OH abundance and distribution. Two models used an alternative OH field next to the prescribed field. Generally, models that simulate a low abundance of CH₃CCl₃ also simulate a low abundance of CH₄. However, there are exceptions, which indicates that CH₄ loss due to OH in the troposphere is not the only cause of the modeled CH₄ differences. Thus, horizontal and vertical transport differences may also be important.
- vi. Further analysis reveals that the simulated CH₄ growth rate shows (weak) correlations with the modeled vertical gradient in the equatorial lower stratosphere. This suggests that differences in vertical mixing of the emissions and in stratosphere-troposphere exchange are the main causes of the model-to-model differences. Next to the interhemispheric transport in models, this issue requires further analysis, e.g. based on the archived model output.
- vii. Finally, the multi-model lifetime estimates for CH₄ and CH₃CCl₃ were found to be fairly constant over the simulation period with median values of 9.99 ± 0.08 and 4.61 ± 0.13 for the period 1992 to 2007. This underscores the fact that OH (assumed constant in the simulations) is the driving factor in the budgets of these

gases, and that transport and temperature (affecting the reaction rate) differences play a smaller role. We find net CH₄ emissions to the atmosphere of 513 ± 9 and 514 ± 14 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ (soil sink subtracted) for the 1990s and 2000s, respectively, are consistent with the atmospheric losses accounted for due to OH, O¹D and Cl in order to simulate CH₄ concentrations and growth rates at the surface sites.

Supplementary material related to this article is available online at:

<http://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/11/12813/2011/acp-11-12813-2011-supplement.pdf>

Acknowledgements. We thank Ingeborg Levin for useful discussions on the possible causes for the decrease in exchange time as derived from the measurements and control simulation in TransCom-CH₄. This work is partly supported by JSPS/MEXT KAKENHI-A grant number 22241008. Generous support of the NIES team with the disk space and FTP services is greatly appreciated. Support of Lori Bruhweiler, Daniel Jacob, Philippe Ciais, and Frederic Chevallier is appreciated in the early stages of this experiment. We thank the ACE-FTS, AGAGE, GMD/ESRL and HALOE teams for observations; EDGAR, GISS/NASA, GFEDv2 (Guido van der Werf), IPSL.WETL (Bruno Ringeval), RIGCRice (Xiaoyuan Yan) for emission inventories. Without these datasets TransCom-CH₄ experiment could not be completed. The ACE mission is funded primarily by the Canadian space Agency. Annemarie Fraser is supported by the UK Natural Environment Research Council National Centre for Earth Observation. ACCESS uses the Met Office Unified ModelTM (UK) with a CSIRO land-surface scheme (CABLE) and the help of Met Office and CSIRO staff, particularly Chris Jones and Fiona O'Connor, Martin Dix and Eva Kowalczyk, was much appreciated. We acknowledge the work of John McGregor and Marcus Thatcher in the development of CCAM. ACCESS and CCAM simulations were undertaken as part of the Australian Climate Change Science Program and used the NCI National Facility in Canberra, Australia. The contribution by the LLNL authors was prepared under Contract DE-AC52-07NA27344, with different parts supported by the IMPACTS project funded by the US DOE (BER) and project (07-ERD-064) funded by the LDRD program at LLNL. Ronald Prinn and Matthew Rigby are supported by NASA-AGAGE Grant NNX11AF17G to MIT. The TOMCAT work at University of Leeds was supported by NERC/NCEO. We sincerely thank two anonymous reviewers and James Wang for providing us constructive comments and helpful suggestions.

Edited by: B. N. Duncan

References

- Aoki, S., Nakazawa, T., Murayama, S., and Kawaguchi S.: Measurements of atmospheric methane at the Japanese Antarctic Station, Syowa, Tellus B, 44, 273–281, 1992.
- Belikov, D., Maksyutov, S., Miyasaka, T., Saeki, T., Zhuravlev, R., and Kiryushov, B.: Mass-conserving tracer transport modelling

- on a reduced latitude-longitude grid with NIES-TM, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 4, 207–222, doi:10.5194/gmd-4-207-2011, 2011.
- Bergamaschi, P., Frankenberg, C., Meirink, J. F., Krol, M., Vilani, M. G., Houweling, S., Dentener, F., Dlugokencky, E. J., Miller, J. B., Gatti, L. V., Engel, A., and Levin, I.: Inverse modeling of global and regional CH₄ emissions using SCIAMACHY satellite retrievals, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 114, D22301, doi:10.1029/2009JD012287, 2009.
- Bloom, S., da Silva, A., Dee, D., Bosilovich, M., Chern, J.-D., Pawson, S., Schubert, S., Sienkiewicz, M., Stajner, I., Tan, W.-W., and Wu, M.-L.: Documentation and Validation of the Goddard Earth Observing System (GEOS) Data Assimilation System – Version 4, Technical Report Series on Global Modeling and Data Assimilation 104606, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Maryland, 26, 2005.
- Bousquet, P., Ciais, P., Miller, J. B., Dlugokencky, E. J., Hauglustaine, D. A., Prigent, C., van der Werf, G. R., Peylin, P., Brunke, E.-G., Carouge, C., Langenfelds, R. L., Lathière, J., Papa, F., Ramonet, M., Schmidt, M., Steele, L. P., Tyler, S. C., and White, J.: Contribution of anthropogenic and natural sources to atmospheric methane variability, *Nature*, 443, 439–443, doi:10.1038/nature05132, 2006.
- Butler, J. H., Daube, B. C., Dutton, G. S., Elkins, J. W., Hall, B. D., Hurst, D. F., King, D. B., Kline, E. S., Lafleur, B. G., Lind, J., Lovitz, S., Mondeel, D. J., Montzka, S. A., Moore, F. L., Nance, J. D., Neu, J. L., Romashkin, P. A., Scheffer, A., and Snible, W. J.: Halocarbons and other atmospheric trace species, Chapter 5, in: CMDL Summary Report No. 27, 2002–2003, edited by: Thompson, T. M., NOAA/US Department of Commerce, Boulder, USA, 115–135, 2004.
- Cao, M., Gregson, K., and Marshall, S.: Global methane emission from wetlands and its sensitivity to climate change, *Atmos. Environ.*, 32, 3293–3299, doi:10.1016/S1352-2310(98)00105-8, 1998.
- Chen, Y.-H. and Prinn, R. G.: Estimation of atmospheric methane emissions between 1996–2001 using a 3-D global chemical transport model, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 111, D10307, doi:10.1029/2005JD006058, 2006.
- Chipperfield, M. P.: New version of the TOMCAT/SLIMCAT offline chemical transport model: intercomparison of stratospheric tracer experiments, *Q. J. Roy. Meteorol. Soc.*, 132, 1179–1203, doi:10.1256/qj.05.51, 2006.
- Corbin, K. D. and Law, R. M.: Extending atmospheric CO₂ and tracer capabilities in ACCESS, CAWCR Technical Report No. 35, The Centre for Australian Weather and Climate Research, ISBN: 978-1-921826-177, Aspendale, 2011.
- Cunnold, D. M., Steele, L. P., Fraser, P. J., Simmonds, P. G., Prinn, R. G., Weiss, R. F., Porter, L. W., Langenfelds, R. L., Wang, H. J., Emmons, L., Tie, X. X., and Dlugokencky, E. J.: In situ measurements of atmospheric methane at GAGE/AGAGE sites during 1985–2000 and resulting source inferences, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 107, 4225, doi:10.1029/2001JD001226, 2002.
- De Mazière, M., Vigouroux, C., Bernath, P. F., Baron, P., Blumenstock, T., Boone, C., Brogniez, C., Catoire, V., Coffey, M., Duchatelet, P., Griffith, D., Hannigan, J., Kasai, Y., Kramer, I., Jones, N., Mahieu, E., Manney, G. L., Piccolo, C., Randall, C., Robert, C., Senten, C., Strong, K., Taylor, J., Tétard, C., Walker, K. A., and Wood, S.: Validation of ACE-FTS v2.2 methane profiles from the upper troposphere to the lower mesosphere, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 8, 2421–2435, doi:10.5194/acp-8-2421-2008, 2008.
- Denning, A. S., Holzer, M., Gurney, K. R., Heimann, M., Law, R. M., Rayner, P. J., Fung, I. Y., Fan, S., Taguchi, S., Friedlingstein, P., Balkanski, Y., Taylor, J., Maiss, M., and Levin, I.: Three-dimensional transport and concentration of SF₆: a model intercomparison study (TransCom-2), *Tellus B*, 51, 266–297, 1999.
- Dentener, F., van Weele, M., Krol, M., Houweling, S., and van Velthoven, P.: Trends and inter-annual variability of methane emissions derived from 1979–1993 global CTM simulations, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 3, 73–88, doi:10.5194/acp-3-73-2003, 2003.
- Dlugokencky, E. J., Masarie, K. A., Lang, P. M., and Tans, P. P.: Continuing decline in the growth rate of the atmospheric methane burden, *Nature*, 393, 447–450, 1998.
- Dlugokencky, E. J., Houweling, S., Bruhwiler, L., Masarie, K. A., Lang, P. M., Miller, J. B., and Tans, P. P.: Atmospheric methane levels off: temporary pause or a new steady-state?, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 30, 1992, doi:10.1029/2003GL018126, 2003.
- Dlugokencky, E. J., Myers, R. C., Lang, P. M., Masarie, K. A., Crotwell, A. M., Thoning, K. W., Hall, B. D., Elkins, J. W., and Steele, L. P.: Conversion of NOAA atmospheric dry air CH₄ mole fractions to a gravimetrically prepared standard scale, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 110, D18306, doi:10.1029/2005JD006035, 2005.
- Emmons, L. K., Walters, S., Hess, P. G., Lamarque, J.-F., Pfister, G. G., Fillmore, D., Granier, C., Guenther, A., Kinnison, D., Laepple, T., Orlando, J., Tie, X., Tyndall, G., Wiedinmyer, C., Baughcum, S. L., and Kloster, S.: Description and evaluation of the Model for Ozone and Related chemical Tracers, version 4 (MOZART-4), *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 3, 43–67, doi:10.5194/gmd-3-43-2010, 2010.
- Etiopie, G. and Milkov, A. V.: A new estimate of global methane flux from onshore and shallow submarine mud volcanoes to the atmosphere, *Environ. Geol.*, 46, 997–1002, doi:10.1007/s00254-004-1085-1, 2004.
- Frankenberg, C., Warneke, T., Butz, A., Aben, I., Hase, F., Spitz, P., and Brown, L. R.: Pressure broadening in the 2ν₃ band of methane and its implication on atmospheric retrievals, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 8, 5061–5075, doi:10.5194/acp-8-5061-2008, 2008.
- Fraser, A., Chan Miller, C., Palmer, P. I., Deutscher, N. M., Jones, N. B., and Griffith, D. W. T.: The Australian methane budget: interpreting surface and train-borne measurements using a chemistry transport model, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 116, D20306, doi:10.1029/2011JD015964, 2011.
- Feng, W., Chipperfield, M. P., Dhomse, S., Monge-Sanz, B. M., Yang, X., Zhang, K., and Ramonet, M.: Evaluation of cloud convection and tracer transport in a three-dimensional chemical transport model, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 5783–5803, doi:10.5194/acp-11-5783-2011, 2011.
- Fung, I., John, J., Lerner, J., Matthews, E., Prather, M., Steele, L. P., and Fraser, P. J.: Three-dimensional model synthesis of the global methane cycle, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 96, 13033–13065, 1991.
- Geller, L. S., Elkins, J. W., Lobert, J. M., Clarke, A. D., Hurst, D. F., Butler, J. H., and Myers, R. C.: Tropospheric SF₆: observed latitudinal distribution and trends, derived emissions and interhemispheric exchange time, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 24, 675–678, 1997.
- Gent, P. R., Yeager, S. G., Neale, R. B., Levis, S., and Bailey, D. A.: Improvements in a half degree atmosphere/land version of the

- CCSM, *Clim. Dynam.*, 79, 25–58, doi:10.1007/s00382-009-0614-8, 2009.
- Gupta, M., Tyler, S., and Cicerone, R.: Modeling atmospheric $\delta^{13}\text{C}_4$ and the causes of recent changes in atmospheric CH₄ amounts, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 101, 22923–22932, doi:10.1029/96JD02386, 1996.
- Hein, R., Crutzen, P. J., and Heimann, M.: An inverse modeling approach to investigate the global atmospheric methane cycle, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 11, 43–76, 1997.
- Hossaini, R., Chipperfield, M. P., Monge-Sanz, B. M., Richards, N. A. D., Atlas, E., and Blake, D. R.: Bromoform and dibromomethane in the tropics: a 3-D model study of chemistry and transport, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 719–735, doi:10.5194/acp-10-719-2010, 2010.
- Hourdin, F., Musat, I., Bony, S., Braconnot, P., Codron, F., Dufresne, J.-L., Fairhead, L., Filiberti, M.-A., Friedlingstein, P., Grandpeix, J.-Y., Krinner, G., Levan, P., and Lott, F.: The LMDZ4 general circulation model: climate performance and sensitivity to parametrized physics with emphasis on tropical convection, *Clim. Dynam.*, 27, 787–813, doi:10.1007/s00382-006-0158-0, 2006.
- Houweling, S., Kaminski, T., Dentener, F., Lelieveld, J., and Heimann, M.: Inverse modeling of methane sources and sinks using the adjoint of a global transport model, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 104, 26137–26160, 1999.
- Houweling, S., Dentener, F., Lelieveld, J., Walter, B., and Dlugokencky, E.: The modeling of tropospheric methane: how well can point measurements be reproduced by a global model?, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 105, 8981–9002, 2000.
- Huijnen, V., Williams, J., van Weele, M., van Noije, T., Krol, M., Dentener, F., Segers, A., Houweling, S., Peters, W., de Laat, J., Boersma, F., Bergamaschi, P., van Velthoven, P., Le Sager, P., Eskes, H., Alkemade, F., Scheele, R., Nédélec, P., and Pätz, H.-W.: The global chemistry transport model TM5: description and evaluation of the tropospheric chemistry version 3.0, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 3, 445–473, doi:10.5194/gmd-3-445-2010, 2010.
- Ito, A. and Inatomi, M.: Use and uncertainty evaluation of a process-based model for assessing the methane budgets of global terrestrial ecosystems, *Biogeosciences Discuss.*, 8, 7033–7070, doi:10.5194/bgd-8-7033-2011, 2011.
- Jacob, D. J., Prather, M. J., Wofsy, S. C., and McElroy, M. B.: Atmospheric distribution of ^{85}Kr simulated with a General Circulation Model, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 92, 6614–6626, 1987.
- Jacob, D. J., Prather, M. J., Rasch, P. J., Shia, R.-L., Balkanski, Y. J., Beagley, S. R., Bergmann, D. J., Blackshear, W. T., Brown, M., Chiba, M., Chipperfield, M. P., Grandpré, J. D., Dignon, J. E., Feichter, J., Genthon, C., Grose, W. L., Kashibhatla, P. S., Kohler, I., Kritz, M. A., Law, K., Penner, J. E., Ramonet, M., Reeves, C. E., Rotman, D. A., Stockwell, D. Z., Velthoven, P. F. J. V., Verver, G., Wild, O., Yang, H., and Zimmermann, P.: Evaluation and intercomparison of global atmospheric transport models using ^{222}Rn and other short-lived tracers, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 102, 5953–5970, 1997.
- Kalnay, E., Kanamitsu, M., Kistler, R., Collins, W., Deaven, D., Gandin, L., Iredell, M., Saha, S., White, G., Woollen, J., Zhu, Y., Chelliah, M., Ebisuzaki, W., Higgins, W., Janowiak, J., Mo, K. C., Ropelewski, C., Wang, J., Leetmaa, A., Reynolds, R., Jenne, R., and Joseph, D.: The NCEP/NCAR 40-yr reanalysis project, *B. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 77, 437–470, 1996.
- Kanakidou, M., Dentener, F. J., Brasseur, G. P., Bernsten, T. K., Collins, W. J., Hauglustaine, D. A., Houweling, S., Isaksen, I. S. A., Krol, M., Lawrence, M. G., Muller, J. F., Poisson, N., Roelofs, G. J., Wang, Y., and Wauben, W. M. F.: 3-D global simulations of tropospheric CO distributions – results of the GIM/IGAC intercomparison 1997 exercise, *Chemosph. Global Change Sci.*, 1, 263–282, 1999.
- Kanamitsu, M., Ebisuzaki, W., Woollen, J., Yang, S. K., Hnilo, J. J., Fiorino, M., and Potter, G. L.: NCEP-DOE AMIP-II reanalysis (R-2), *B. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 83, 1631–1643, 2002.
- Kawa, S. R., Erickson III, D. J., Pawson, S., and Zhu, Z.: Global CO₂ transport simulations using meteorological data from the NASA data assimilation system, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 109, D18312, doi:10.1029/2004JD004554, 2004.
- Krol, M. C., van Leeuwen, P.-J., and Lelieveld, J.: Global OH trend inferred from methylchloroform measurements, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 103, 10697–10711, 1998.
- Krol, M. C., Lelieveld, J., Oram, D. E., Sturrock, G. A., Penkett, S. A., Brenninkmeijer, C. A. M., Gros, V., Williams, J., and Scheeren, H. A.: Continuing emissions of methyl chloroform from Europe, *Nature*, 421, 131–135, 2003.
- Krol, M., Houweling, S., Bregman, B., van den Broek, M., Segers, A., van Velthoven, P., Peters, W., Dentener, F., and Bergamaschi, P.: The two-way nested global chemistry-transport zoom model TM5: algorithm and applications, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 5, 417–432, doi:10.5194/acp-5-417-2005, 2005.
- Lamarque, J.-F., Bond, T. C., Eyring, V., Granier, C., Heil, A., Klimont, Z., Lee, D., Liousse, C., Mieville, A., Owen, B., Schultz, M. G., Shindell, D., Smith, S. J., Stehfest, E., Van Aardenne, J., Cooper, O. R., Kainuma, M., Mahowald, N., McConnell, J. R., Naik, V., Riahi, K., and van Vuuren, D. P.: Historical (1850–2000) gridded anthropogenic and biomass burning emissions of reactive gases and aerosols: methodology and application, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 7017–7039, doi:10.5194/acp-10-7017-2010, 2010.
- Lambert, G. and Schmidt, S.: Reevaluation of the oceanic flux of methane: uncertainties and long term variations, *Chemosph. Global Change Sci.*, 26, 579–589, 1993.
- Langenfelds, R. L., Francey, R. J., Pak, B. C., Steele, L. P., Lloyd, J., Trudinger, C. M., and Allison, C. E.: Interannual growth rate variations of atmospheric CO₂ and its $\delta^{13}\text{C}$, H₂, CH₄, and CO between 1992 and 1999 linked to biomass burning, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 16, 1048, doi:10.1029/2001GB001466, 2002.
- Law, R. M., Rayner, P. J., Denning, A. S., Erickson, D., Fung, I. Y., Heimann, M., Piper, S. C., Ramonet, M., Taguchi, S., Taylor, J. A., Trudinger, C. M., and Watterson, I. G.: Variations in modeled atmospheric transport of carbon dioxide and the consequences for CO₂ inversions, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 10, 783–796, doi:10.1029/96GB01892, 1996.
- Law, R. M., Kowalczyk, E. A., and Wang, Y. P.: Using atmospheric CO₂ data to assess a simplified carbon-climate simulation for the 20th century, *Tellus B*, 53, 427–437, doi:10.1111/j.1600-0889.2006.00198.x, 2006.
- Law, R. M., Peters, W., Rodenbeck, C., Aulagnier, C., Baker, I., Bergmann, D. J., Bousquet, P., Brandt, J., Bruhwiler, L., Cameron-Smith, P. J., Christensen, J. H., Delage, F., Denning, A. S., Fan, S., Geels, C., Houweling, S., Imasu, R., Karstens, U., Kawa, S. R., Kleist, J., Krol, M. C., Lin, S.-J., Lokupitiya, R., Maki, T., Maksyutov, S., Niwa, Y., On-

- ishi, R., Parazoo, N., Patra, P. K., Pieterse, G., Rivier, L., Satoh, M., Serrar, S., Taguchi, S., Takigawa, M., Vautard, R., Vermeulen, A. T., and Zhu, Z.: TransCom model simulations of hourly atmospheric CO₂: experimental overview and diurnal cycle results for 2002, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 22, GB3009, doi:10.1029/2007GB003050, 2008.
- Levin, I. and Hesshaimer, V.: Refining of atmospheric transport model entries by the globally observed passive tracer distributions of ⁸⁵krypton and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆), *J. Geophys. Res.*, 101, 16745–16755, 1996.
- Levin, I., Naegler, T., Heinz, R., Osusko, D., Cuevas, E., Engel, A., Ilmberger, J., Langenfelds, R. L., Neininger, B., Rohden, C. v., Steele, L. P., Weller, R., Worthy, D. E., and Zimov, S. A.: The global SF₆ source inferred from long-term high precision atmospheric measurements and its comparison with emission inventories, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 2655–2662, doi:10.5194/acp-10-2655-2010, 2010.
- Matthews, E. and Fung, I.: Methane emissions from natural wetlands: Global distribution, area, and ecology of sources, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 1, 61–86, doi:10.1029/GB001i001p00061, 1987.
- McCulloch, A. and Midgley, P. M.: The history of methyl chloroform emissions: 1951–2000, *Atmos. Environ.*, 35, 5311–5319, 2001.
- Mikaloff-Fletcher, S. E., Tans, P. P., Bruhwiler, L. M., Miller, J. B., and Heimann, M.: CH₄ sources estimated from atmospheric observations of CH₄ and its ¹³C/¹²C isotopic ratios: 2. Inverse modeling of CH₄ fluxes from geographical regions, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 18, GB4005, doi:10.1029/2004GB002224, 2004.
- Mitchell, T. D. and Jones, P. D.: An improved method of constructing a database of monthly climate observations and associated high-resolution grids, *Int. J. Climatol.*, 25, 693–712, doi:10.1002/joc.1181, 2005.
- Montzka, S. A., Krol, M., Dlugokencky, E., Hall, B., Jockel, P., and Lelieveld, J.: Small interannual variability of global atmospheric hydroxyl, *Science*, 331, 67–69, doi:10.1126/science.1197640, 2011.
- Olivier, J. G. J. and Berdowski, J. J. M.: Global emissions sources and sinks, in: *The Climate System*, edited by: Berdowski, J., Guicherit, R., and Heij, B. J., ISBN 9058092550, A. A. Balkema Publishers/Swets & Zeitlinger Pub., Lisse, The Netherlands, 33–78, 2001.
- Onogi, K., Tsutsui, J., Koide, H., Sakamoto, M., Kobayashi, S., Hatsushika, H., Matsumoto, T., Yamazaki, N., Kamahori, H., Takahashi, K., Kadokura, S., Wada, K., Kato, K., Oyama, R., Ose, T., Mannoji, N., and Taira, R.: The JRA-25 reanalysis, *J. Meteorol. Soc. Jpn.*, 85, 369–432, 2007.
- Park, J. H., Russell, J. M., Gordley, L. L., Drayson, S. R., Benner, D. C., McInerney, J. M., Gunson, M. R., Toon, G. C., Sen, B., Blavier, J. F., Webster, C. R., Zipf, E. C., Erdman, P., Schmidt, U., and Schiller, C.: Validation of halogen occultation experiment CH₄ measurements from the UARS, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 101, 10183–10203, 1996.
- Patra, P. K., Law, R. M., Peters, W., Rodenbeck, C., Takigawa, M., Aulagnier, C., Baker, I., Bergmann, D. J., Bousquet, P., Brandt, J., Bruhwiler, L., Cameron-Smith, P. J., Christensen, J. H., Delage, F., Denning, A. S., Fan, S., Geels, C., Houweling, S., Imasu, R., Karstens, U., Kawa, S. R., Kleist, J., Krol, M. C., Lin, S.-J., Lokupitiya, R., Maki, T., Maksyutov, S., Niwa, Y., Onishi, R., Parazoo, N., Pieterse, G., Rivier, L., Satoh, M., Serrar, S., Taguchi, S., Vautard, R., Vermeulen, A. T., and Zhu, Z.: TransCom model simulations of hourly atmospheric CO₂: analysis of synoptic-scale variations for the period 2002–2003, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 22, GB4013, doi:10.1029/2007GB003081, 2008.
- Patra, P. K., Takigawa, M., Dutton, G. S., Uhse, K., Ishijima, K., Lintner, B. R., Miyazaki, K., and Elkins, J. W.: Transport mechanisms for synoptic, seasonal and interannual SF₆ variations and “age” of air in troposphere, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 9, 1209–1225, doi:10.5194/acp-9-1209-2009, 2009a.
- Patra, P. K., Takigawa, M., Ishijima, K., Choi, B.-C., Cunnold, D., Dlugokencky, E. J., Fraser, P., Gomez-Pelaez, A. J., Goo, T.-Y., Kim, J.-S., Krummel, P., Langenfelds, R., Meinhardt, F., Mukai, H., O’Doherty, S., Prinn, R. G., Simmonds, P., Steele, P., Tohjima, Y., Tsuboi, K., Uhse, K., Weiss, R., Worthy, D., and Nakazawa, T.: Growth rate, seasonal, synoptic, diurnal variations and budget of methane in lower atmosphere, *J. Meteorol. Soc. Jpn.*, 87, 635–663, 2009b.
- Patra, P. K., Houweling, S., Krol, M., Bousquet, P., Bruhwiler, L., and Jacob, D.: Protocol for TransCom CH₄ intercomparison, Version 7, http://www.jamstec.go.jp/frcgc/research/d4/prabir/papers/TC-CH4protocol_v7.pdf (last access: 26 April 2010), 2010.
- Pickett-Heaps, C. A., Jacob, D. J., Wecht, K. J., Kort, E. A., Wofsy, S. C., Diskin, G. S., Worthy, D. E. J., Kaplan, J. O., Bey, I., and Drevet, J.: Magnitude and seasonality of wetland methane emissions from the Hudson Bay Lowlands (Canada), *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 3773–3779, doi:10.5194/acp-11-3773-2011, 2011.
- Plumb, R. A.: A “tropical pipe” model of stratospheric transport, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 101, 3957–3972, doi:10.1029/95JD03002, 1996.
- Press, W. H., Teukolsky, S. A., Vetterling, W. T., and Flannery, B. P.: *Numerical Recipes: The Art of Scientific Computing*, Cambridge University Press., New York, ISBN 0521308119, 1986.
- Prigent, C., Papa, F., Aires, F., Rossow, W. B., and Matthews, E.: Global inundation dynamics inferred from multiple satellite observations, 1993–2000, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 112, D12107, doi:10.1029/2006JD007847, 2007.
- Prinn, R. G., Weiss, R., Fraser, P., Simmonds, P., Cunnold, D., Alyea, F., O’Doherty, S., Salameh, P., Miller, B., Huang, J., Wang, R., Hartley, D., Harth, C., Steele, L., Sturrock, G., Midgley, P., and McCulloch, A.: A history of chemically and radiatively important gases in air deduced from ALE/GAGE/AGAGE, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 105, 17751–17792, doi:10.1029/2000JD900141, 2000.
- Prinn, R. G., Huang, J., Weiss, R. F., Cunnold, D. M., Fraser, P. J., Simmonds, P. G., McCulloch, A., Harth, C., Reimann, S., Salameh, P., O’Doherty, S., Wang, R. H. J., Porter, L. W., Miller, B. R., and Krummel, P. B.: Evidence for variability of atmospheric hydroxyl radicals over the past quarter century, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 32, L07809, doi:10.1029/2004GL022228, 2005.
- Rasmussen, R. A. and Khalil, M. A. K.: Atmospheric methane in recent and ancient atmospheres: concentrations, trends, and inter-hemispheric gradient, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 89, 11599–11605, 1984.
- Rigby, M., Prinn, R. G., Fraser, P. J., Simmonds, P. G., Langenfelds, R. L., Huang, J., Cunnold, D. M., Steele, L. P., Krummel, P. B., Weiss, R. F., O’Doherty, S., Salameh, P. K., Wang, H. J., Harth, C. M., Muhle, J., and Porter, L. W.: Renewed growth of atmospheric methane, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 35,

tions of the inventory and mitigation potential of methane emissions from rice cultivation conducted using the 2006 intergovernmental panel on climate change guidelines, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 23, GB2002, doi:10.1029/2008GB003299, 2009.

Yoshida, Y., Ota, Y., Eguchi, N., Kikuchi, N., Nobuta, K., Tran, H., Morino, I., and Yokota, T.: Retrieval algorithm for CO₂ and CH₄ column abundances from short-wavelength infrared spectral observations by the Greenhouse gases observing satellite, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 4, 717–734, doi:10.5194/amt-4-717-2011, 2011.